

THE  
CHRISTIAN  
REMEMBRANCER.

JUNE, 1832.

---

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

- ART. I.—1. *The Bible Society Question, in its Principle and its Details, considered.* By the Rev. SAMUEL CHARLES WILKS, M. A. 8vo. Pp. 144. London: Cochran and Key; and J. Hatchard and Son. 1832.
2. *The Bible Society: its Constitution impartially considered.* By a CLERICAL MEMBER OF THE SOCIETY. 3vo. Pp. 26. London: Cochran and Key; Hatchard and Son; Holdsworth and Ball; Seeley and Sons; and Duncan. 1832.
3. *Reply to a Letter from the Rev. A. Brandram, M. A.* By T. PELL PLATT, Esq. F.A.S., *Honorary Librarian to the British and Foreign Bible Society.* 8vo. Pp. 24. London: Seeley and Sons. 1831.
4. *Facts respecting certain Versions of the Holy Scripture published by the British and Foreign Bible Society.* By T. PELL PLATT, Esq. F.A.S. 8vo. Pp. 40. London: Hatchard and Son; Seeley and Sons; Cochran and Key; and Holdsworth and Ball. 1831.
5. *Sundry Tracts.*

THE theological and religious world may occasionally suppose they have ground to complain of our tardiness, because we do not notice every subject of predominating occasional interest, as early as some of our contemporaries. We endeavour to compensate this deficiency (if such it should appear) by bestowing on such matters the reflection, and educing the information, which time and study alone will permit us to do. It is now a twelvemonth since a remarkable æra commenced in the history of the Bible Society; the question which has agitated that association has rung through almost every species of periodical,—newspapers not excepted. But the CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER has been silent on the subject. Would we have our readers infer an absence of interest on the part of the conductors of this publication? By no means: and even if we were not disposed to take any very considerable interest in the question, we should conceive the public entitled

to our opinion on a subject of this nature, which has produced so general an excitement. But in order that we might take a clear view of this controversy, we have found it necessary to go over a great mass of materials; nor do we profess to have read, even at the present moment, a great number of pamphlets which both sides have produced. From what we *have* read, however, we are disposed to infer that an extension of our reading would not proportionally extend our information. The arguments on both sides are little better than re-echoed by the respective writers; arguments which, as it appears to us, deal very widely with the main point of debate. The best book we have read on either side is, beyond comparison, Mr. Wilks's; it is very methodical, very elaborate, but very mild; written, indeed, in the best possible tone; earnest without acrimony, though dealing with opponents not the very coolest; candid, but dexterous; evidently the production of an unsuspecting and Christian heart, believing all things, and hoping all things. We have here none of those claims to identification with the Bible, none of those *petitiones principii*, those vainglorious and exaggerated pretensions, commonly advanced on the part of Mr. Wilks's colleagues. The Bible Society may be proud of their advocate; and if he has not succeeded in exculpating their conduct, they may be sure it is because he has undertaken a task impossible to execute. We shall therefore take this pamphlet as the groundwork of our survey, illustrating, occasionally, from other sources.

If our readers will do us the favour to revert to our number for August, 1830, they will there see our views with regard to the claims of the Bible Society on *Churchmen*. We there contended, 1. That in respect of its *domestic* and *colonial* objects, the society had been superseded to Churchmen, from the first moment of its existence, by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 2. That the *conversion* of the heathen by mere Bibles, was a pure fallacy; and that the foreign department of the society was exceptionably conducted. 3. That the society was radically unsound in its constitution, and had grossly violated even its own regulations. On the first of these allegations we shall now offer nothing immediate, as nothing, which the present controversy has produced, bears at all upon the subject: but in the course of observation, it will be impossible not to contrast the effects of an union with those of a *combination of disunions*. The third, together with the conduct of the society's foreign operations, is the substance of the present debate; but as the conversion of the heathen has been mooted in the course of the discussion, we will briefly dispose of it first. Our readers may then fairly connect our former article with this, and consider them as constituting one brief, but complete view of the merits of this celebrated question.

Mr. Wilks charges with popery those who do not concur with the Bible Society in the opinion that a heathen may be converted to pure Christianity by the Bible, without note or comment. We might say, if the Bible is so plain, even to the heathen, how comes it that the learned gentlemen of the Bible Society are not sufficiently agreed in its meaning to offer ONE prayer in common? not even the prayer which is written in that same Bible? But having thrown his dart, Mr. Wilks falls back upon no less a reserve than the venerated Bishop of Salisbury. Were the present a question of learning or authority, such an opponent would be formidable indeed; happily for us it is nothing of the kind. We will take his lordship's own words:

Popish writers, who concur with the opponents of the Bible Society, say, that the Gentiles were converted by preaching, not by sending Bibles to them. But in this they are greatly mistaken, as far as the spirit of the objection goes. The first Christian Church which was settled at Rome was instructed by the epistles of St. Paul, without note or comment, before the apostles had preached amongst them; and long before their days, a great revival of religion among the Jews, after their return from Babylon, was effected by the Bible, by the reading of the book of the law to them. During their long stay at Babylon, the Hebrew language was greatly corrupted in its vernacular use. The language of the law was become a strange language to them: it was therefore rendered, where necessary, into language that they understood. But it was still the book of the law, the Scripture, that was read to them in a language which was understood by the people. It was by the diligent reading of the Scriptures that the Bereans were converted to Christianity. In the Scriptures they sought for evidences of Christ, and with them they compared the preaching of the apostles; to see "whether these things were so," whether the prophecies to which the apostles appealed, were as they reported them. They made the Scriptures their rule of faith; and in this followed the direction of our Saviour: "Search the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of me."—*Wilks*, pp. 24, 25.

These observations are evidently wide of the question, which is not, Whether the apostles wrote or preached first? but, *Whether they ever wrote epistles to those who were not already Christians?* The Romans were not only Christians when St. Paul wrote to them, but their faith was spoken of THROUGHOUT the whole world.\* It would indeed have been strange if so abstruse a treatise as the epistle to the Romans, the *crux theologorum* to the present hour, had been written to heathens, unacquainted even with the terms which abound throughout it. Doubtless, the increased knowledge of the Scriptures effected several revolutions in the Jewish religion, not only after the Babylonian captivity, but in the times of David and of Josiah. So too did the same circumstance at the time of the Christian Reformation. These facts would be perfectly applicable, if the point contended for, were the excellence and reforming power of the Scriptures, which no Protestant disputes: but as applied to the conversion of heathens they have no force whatever. The Bereans were not

---

\* Rom. i. 8.

heathens, but Jews; nor were they converted by the Scriptures. They were converted by St. Paul's preaching; and had not the Gospel been preached to them, they would have died Jews. They brought St. Paul's preaching to the test of Scripture, and therein we Protestants commend, and profess to follow them; and in this they followed the direction of our Saviour (*given to Jews also*). In no one instance which the reverend Prelate has selected, has he at all touched the question, *Whether a society for giving the Bible without note or comment, can reasonably expect to convert the heathen?* That it cannot, we shall adduce a fact in presumption, which cannot be contested or qualified, since it is narrated by Dr. Marshman, himself a member of the Bible Society, and quoted by Mr. Platt, to *prove* that the heathen may be converted by the Bible without note or comment.

About three years ago, a number of persons were found inhabiting certain villages near Dacca, who had forsaken idolatry, and who constantly refused to Brahmans the usual honours paid to them beyond the other classes of the community. They were also said to be remarkable for the correctness of their conduct, and particularly for their adherence to truth. These were occasionally visited by several of our Christian brethren, both European and native, and were said to be scattered through ten or twelve villages. They were, however, the followers of no particular leader, as is the case with many sects among the Hindoos; but, from their professing to be *in search of a true gooroo, or teacher*, they were termed *Sutya-Gooroos*. Some of our native friends, being exceedingly desirous of knowing from whence they had derived all their ideas, were at length told they had imbibed them from a book which was carefully preserved in one of their villages. On arriving at this village, they were shewn a book much worn, kept in a case (I think of brass) which had been made for the sake of preserving it, and which our friends were told had been there *many years*, although none of those present could say from whence it came. On examination, this book was found to be a copy of the first edition of the Bengalee New Testament, printed at Serampore in 1800. After this, numbers of these *Sutya-Gooroos* came to Dacca, and, with Mr. Leonard, and various native Christian brethren there, described a number of things mentioned in the New Testament, particularly those which related to caste, and the distinction of food. This ended in three of them being baptized, in the course of a few months, on a profession of faith in Christ, who afterwards returned to their own villages. Our aged native brother, Krishnoo, (baptized in 1800,) went among them last August; and at the village where he was constrained to remain on account of the rains, he found a copy of the second edition of the Bengalee New Testament, which they prized very highly, although *they had not as yet made an open profession of Christianity*.—*Platt's Tracts*, p. 27.

Here was the experiment tried under every circumstance of advantage, and yet the Bengalee Testament had done so little in "many years," that its students were in search of a true teacher, and had made no open profession of Christianity. This "*Sutya-Gooroo*" character is precisely that of the Ethiopian in Acts viii., to whom we alluded when we last discussed this subject. In truth, when this opinion (to invalidate which we have never seen *ONE FACT* produced) is stigmatised as Popish, it is always evident that the objector does not know what the Popish doctrine is. The Papist sets the Church



above the Bible,—we set the Bible above the Church ;—to the Bible we refer Clergy and laity ;—those, who, comparing our religion with the Bible, think us in fundamental error, we allow to depart ;—we challenge men to try us, as the Bereans tried St. Paul, by the Scriptures. All this constitutes a wide distinction between us and popery ; and, so long as we admit all this, we shall not be frightened by a hard word from an opinion not only grounded on facts, but also on the testimony of that very Bible which is so rashly mis-defended by ill-judging Protestants. The Bible is the great storehouse of divine truth, from which the Church must be constantly supplied ; and when she undertakes to convert the heathen, the Bible must teach her how to set about the task. It must supply her with wisdom, with knowledge, with doctrine, with argument ; and it will inform her that the written, unexpounded word, is not to be the preliminary, much less, the single instrument for the conversion of the nations.\*

But to proceed to the main subject involved in the present controversy—the constitution of the Bible Society. On this point we have the advantage of impartiality, so far as that quality may be inferred, from our independence of both parties. We do not expect to please either in what we shall say ; but we write for the conviction of those minds who would embrace truth rather than party. The secession which has lately taken place from the Bible Society, is founded on the eligibility of Socinians and other heretics to the committee, and, indeed the co-operation of heretics generally ; a subject which we discussed in our former article. But as seceders generally discover, in their progress, several reasons to fortify the original and principal ground of secession, and several more why they should recede still further from the point of starting ; so, in the present instance, a vast number of other accusations have been brought against the Bible Society, which we shall briefly discuss. The old Society, it appears to us, has the worst of the argument, but its advocates, for the most part, are greatly superior to their adversaries in temper and decorum. They do not, certainly, abandon their old *position*, that the Bible Society is the Bible, and that to reject one is to reject the other ; but this may be extenuated, since they have been so habituated to this policy, that they, perhaps, adopt it unconsciously.†

\* The verses of Dryden quoted by Mr. Wilks, have nothing to do with the instruction of the heathen. Nor was Dryden then, as he says, “*professedly a Roman Catholic,*” but *professedly* a member of the Church of England, when he wrote his “*Religio Laici,*” as Mr. Wilks could not have failed to discover, had he read the poem he has *misquoted*.

† Witness the following flourishes :—“*The invention of printing, and the Bible Society, may be considered as the most efficient of these means : and the duty of employing them, inasmuch as they are evidently what PROVIDENCE has disclosed, is indisputable, and cannot be GUILTLESSLY neglected*”!!!—*The Bible Society ; by a Clerical Member*, p. 11.

“*Much of what has been said against the Society might have been said, with equal suitableness, against many parts of our SAVIOUR’S conduct and that of his apostles !*”—*Ibid.* p. 25.

We will defy the zeal and ingenuity of Mr. Wilks himself to detect any fallacy in the following argument. The Bible Society's Committee consists of six foreigners, fifteen churchmen, and fifteen "members of other denominations of Christians." (Rule IX.) But an English Socinian is *eligible* on the Committee. Now an English Socinian is neither a foreigner nor a Churchman; he *must*, therefore, under the rule of the Bible Society, be a *Christian*. The attempt to blink this fact is in vain. It is wholly irrelevant, therefore, to say, that "eligibility is not election,"\* and that no Socinian has ever been elected: the real question is, *Whether any man, believing the doctrine of the Trinity to be of the very substance of Christianity, can conscientiously sanction, by his subscription, a rule declaratory of the direct contrary?* The present seceders from the Bible Society remonstrated long and urgently on this subject, but in vain; at last they determined to bring the rule before a general meeting, in order to see whether a majority of the Society would consider it inclusive of Arians, Neologians, and Socinians. That meeting, after a very stormy debate, decided in the affirmative; and accordingly, those members of the Bible Society, who objected to the proposition, that *Arians, Neologians, and Socinians, are Christians*, were necessitated to secede from a community which palpably averred this doctrine.

On this point, we think the Bible Society was always wrong; and, in the present instance, guilty of a wrong incapable of extenuation. All its friends and advocates tell us that an Anti-trinitarian never was elected on the committee, and never would have been. Why, then, not concede, to conciliate a very large and respectable portion of the body, what was, at least, a merely verbal alteration? Or still better, why not say at once, that Arians and Socinians were not contemplated by the rule? Did the warmest supporters of the Bible Society believe Anti-trinitarians to be Christians? Why, then, suffer their rules to make such a declaration? Or the rule might have specified "*persons of other religious denominations*," without using the word *Christian* at all;† and whatever security existed for the non-election of a Neologian or Socinian would ensure the exclusion of a Jew or Mahometan;—in short, of any one who was not a Christian. But the word "*Christians*" being specified, and Socinians being included in the expression, there could be (as it appears to us plain people) but one course for those who thought Socinianism as much Christianity as the worship of Fo. The fact, that the Mahometan and the Jew are *not* eligible on the Committee, while a Socinian *is*, is a sufficient proof that the Society

\* Wilks, p. 10.

† Mr. Dudley regrets that such was not the case, (*Two Letters*, p. 5.) and says that "it would have equally expressed the meaning of those who prepared the laws." Why, then, was not this simple alteration made?

takes Socinians to be Christians. For our own parts, we think Mahometanism better Christianity, and Judaism infinitely better religion, than the Socinian scheme; and we have no doubt, that herein we have the pleasure to agree with Mr. Wilks, and with very many of his friends, who, strangely enough, require, as a "simple principle," the assent of every member of the Bible Society to the Christianity of those who deny the Lord that bought them.

The reply, that immorality is as much contrary to Christianity as Socinianism, and that therefore those who would exclude Socinians from Bible Committees, should also exclude notorious sinners, fails to touch the real question. The rule specifies members of *denominations* of Christians. Now a man may belong outwardly to some Christian *denomination*, without being a real or spiritual Christian; the rule, therefore, does not commit the Society on the point of moral character. But on *this* point it *does* commit them, that *Socinianism is a Christian denomination*; in other words, that a Socinian, supposing him conscientious in belief and practice, is a Christian; which no consistent Churchman will allow, or any orthodox Dissenter.

The Society's rule, therefore, was, it appears to us, a sufficient ground of secession, had there been no other. But the evil was far less merely nominal than it was represented by the Society's friends. It is said that no Socinian was ever elected on the Committee. But by the VIIth rule, governors are entitled to attend and vote at all meetings of the Committee. If, therefore, the orthodoxy of the general body revolted from the appointment of heretical delegates, this would be no security for the exclusion of any such persons, whenever they might be inclined to pay their subscription of five guineas, or donation of fifty. The XIIIth rule is even yet more objectionable. It gives to every *Dissenting minister*, who is a member, the privilege of a Committee-man. Thus, after vaunting that they have never elected a Socinian on their Committee, it appears that a Socinian minister, *for the very reason that he is a Socinian minister*, may elect himself! If the Society have always entertained that abhorrence of Socinian co-operation, which they assure us they have, why enact a rule whereby a Socinian, a *TEACHER* of Socinianism, may elect himself a director of their entire affairs, against the wishes of the whole body?

Mr. Platt, with whose scholarship, talent, and piety, none can be unacquainted, and whose attachment to the Bible Society was not slight, truly says:—

My opinion is decided and unchanged, that the Bible Society, by giving the Socinian teacher a seat in its Committees, and inviting, or at all events permitting him, to stand up among its advocates at Public Meetings, does accredit him among the people as a minister of Christ. I believe that the pure doctrines of our own Church, and of our Dissenting Christian brethren, had spread light enough among the great body of our people to make them know at least that

the Socinian was a teacher "*sui generis*," and separated from all the rest by a wide distinction, though they might not justly appreciate the nature and importance of that distinction. But then comes in the Bible Society, speaking to them of the delightful harmony in which it has united all Christian sects and parties, and telling them how within its precincts all minor distinctions are forgotten, and Christians can all give each other the right hand of fellowship. And among these Christians stands forth the Socinian, equal with the rest, and undistinguished. What is, what must be, the effect?—*Reply*, p. 11.

Let the Christian, the Churchman especially, determine how far it is consistent with his principles to belong to a society for the distribution of the Bible in all languages, by the rules of which twenty-one out of a committee of thirty *may* be deniers of their Lord; which committee *may* be swamped, without control of the Society, by the accession of an indefinite number of Socinian volunteers; and in which every Socinian member who possesses a half-crown licence to perform the part of a public teacher, becomes, *ipso facto*, a legislator! And a legislator on what?—On the translation of the Holy Scriptures! The authors of "the Improved Version" feeding, *ex officio*, the Church universal with the bread of life!

But it is said, *the more Socinian subscriptions the better!* Because, marvelling reader, the Bible Society circulates in England the authorized version only, and *that* tends to the ruin of Socinianism! And can it be thought that, when the Socinians made their "great concessions," they had not sat down first and counted the cost? Can it be supposed that they would subscribe money for no other purpose than to disseminate opinions directly opposed to their own? For, be it remembered, the Socinian is not circumstanced like Protestant Christians,—he does not refer his faith to the Bible,—certainly not to our version of it. Much of the original Scriptures he calls spurious or apocryphal; indeed (for it is not here our business to sift all that Socinianism *unbelieves*), very little of the Scriptures will pass with any Socinian for the pure Word of God.\* The Socinian, then, does not give his guinea, and impeach his consistency without prospect of an equivalent. And what that is, our readers may collect from Mr. Norris's account of the circumstances which led to the Dean of Carlisle's secession from the Society, and also from more modern, and even more objectionable transactions, to which we shall presently advert. It will appear that not only notes and comments have been obtruded on the Society's "simple

---

\* Did our space permit, we might here introduce Mr. Wilks's somewhat prolix enumeration of reasons why Socinians should not subscribe to a society *faithfully* performing all the Bible Society professes. The reasoning is sound; indeed, axiomatic: but Socinians *do* subscribe, nevertheless. Did not Mr. Wilks see the *conclusion* from this fact? Mr. Gurney's apology is, that "they make a large concession for the sake of that *general good* which the Society is effecting." (*Terms of Union*, p. 11.) What good can the Socinian see in the distribution of (what he must think) corruption as the true Word of God?

principle ;" but that those notes and comments have been Neologian and Socinian !

Before, however, we quit this part of the subject, we must observe that the opinions of the remonstrants were not merely directed against the possible influence of heretics in committees ; but they embraced the entire question of heretical co-operation. Many of the arguments by which they supported their views on this point, appear to us unsound ; the scripture examples are, at best, very distant analogies, and, as we must think, inapplicable to the case ; the scripture precepts refer rather to the constitution of a Church than of a society, as their opponents fail not to remark. But although the seceders may not have rested their cause on the strong foundation they were entitled to take, we think that, in point of principle, they were entirely right. The inconveniences, the worse than inconveniences, to which the believer was subjected by the Bible Society's system, were rational motives for dissolving a connexion which required them. Dean Hodgson made no objection to act with the Socinian, Mr. Clarke, in the mere matter of distributing Bibles ; but it was soon found that their reciprocal neutrality could not be maintained. Mr. Clarke, by distributing Bibles, acquired a facility which he failed not to improve, of dispersing heretical publications and libels on Christianity ; and the Dean, as a conscientious man, could not afford the semblance of countenance to such a proceeding. In like manner, Mr. Hawtrej, a clergyman, and one of the Society's officers, was actually PUBLICLY CALLED TO ORDER on the platform, by a Socinian, for recognising the DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT ! To say that instances of this kind were few, is no reply to an objection upon PRINCIPLE. They were few, because Socinians are few. But "the offence is rank," though it may have been seldom committed. What must be the feelings of a promiscuous audience on the merits of the Bible itself, when, in a meeting of persons, whose "simple object" is its distribution, it is DISORDERLY to acknowledge the Saviour ? ! And if Socinian contributors were few, the more reason why, when the Society's funds could not be more materially impaired, and a most respectable portion of the subscribers might be conciliated, heretical co-operation should be altogether refused.

That heretics had *some* motive for joining a body of orthodox men in circulating a version perhaps the purest in the world, cannot be doubted. Their principal motive was, apparently, the character of the Society's foreign operations. These were necessarily less known to the English public ; that "antiquated source of litigation" (as Mr. Wilks denominates a transaction, which came to light only six years ago), the Apocrypha affair, having been discovered, through what was, humanly speaking, mere accident. The circulation of the

Apocrypha as the word of God, had a manifest tendency to introduce doubts on the authority of writings which came in such suspicious company, and claimed no higher origin. The plain Christian, who made the discovery that the Apocrypha was human, could scarcely entertain very exalted notions of books from the hand of a Society, which had already palmed upon him an imposture as the word of God, and professed the circulation of "the Holy Scriptures," their "SOLE OBJECT.\*" Hence, he would be especially well prepared for the entertainment of infidel and heretical objections. Nor was the Apocrypha the only stain on the Society's foreign proceedings, or the only merit which recommended them to the disinterested patronage of British heresy. Their foreign versions were not only heretical, but, in direct violation of the Society's fundamental rule, they were accompanied with heretical NOTES AND COMMENTS!

The permission of notes and comments at all, in versions circulated by the Bible Society, is a direct infringement of the fundamental rule: "The designation of this Society, shall be the BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY, of which THE SOLE OBJECT shall be to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures, WITHOUT NOTE OR COMMENT." Mr. Wilks says most truly, but most extraordinarily, considering which side of the question he takes,

*I say at once and unequivocally, that if the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, has in any ONE instance violated, or connived at the violation of, this fundamental rule, it is no longer worthy of public confidence. The merit of a version is a matter of which few can judge; and mistakes may occur, notwithstanding the best intentions and the greatest vigilance; but an infringement of a plain rule is an obvious fact, and every person is competent to award the verdict.* P. 104.

On this shewing, the question is settled, and the Society "no longer worthy of public confidence." Mr. Wilks, in another part of his work, while defending Professor Levaie from the charge of Socinianism, quotes the "headings" of his Bible, of which the following are some:—

\* Even Mr. Wilks is at fault here. "The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge," says he, "circulates Bibles with the Apocrypha; even its Family Bible is thus furnished." True: but that is not the gist of the question. Has the Christian Knowledge Society any such rule as this, "THE SOLE OBJECT" of the Society "shall be to encourage a wider circulation of THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?" The Bible Society has. The question then is, Did the committee in Earl-street believe the Apocrypha to be Holy Scripture; or did they violate the Society's "simple principle" and fundamental rule, and with it the plainest dictates of good faith and honour? There is no possible third supposition. Mr. Wilks takes credit to the Society for not adulterating the *English Bible*. There was, doubtless, a good reason for that. The "Clerical Member of the Society" says, "it is a matter of no small satisfaction that the Society has removed the stumbling-block (the Apocrypha) out of the way," (which the Society put in the way first of all), and that it confines itself, according to the obvious meaning of its Rules, to the circulation of the Scriptures alone, unmixed with any human writing." So, then, the Society's own advocate here admits a violation of the obvious meaning of the Rules! But his "no small satisfaction," that the Scriptures are circulated "unmixed with any human writing," we shall be compelled, in justice, cruelly to dissipate.

John i. *S. Jean enseigne que Jésus Christ est Dieu.*

Rom. iv. *La justification par la foi est prouvée.*

1 John iv. *Jésus Christ est le vrai Dieu, et la vie éternelle.*

These certainly are not Socinian comments; but are they not *comments*? What difference can result from the mere circumstance that the comment is written at the head instead of the foot of the page?

The infraction is the more scandalous, inasmuch as prevarication is always more offensive than undisguised mendacity. In Professor Levade's version, there were *actual* notes which Mr. Wilks condemns, and which, according to him, the Society condemned also. But neither Mr. Wilks nor the Society had any scruple about these "headings;" and headings similar to these are found in the Society's English Bibles. Yet the Society had the grace to bully poor Levade about notes explanatory of such words as Mammon, Hosanna, &c., (which notes, by the way, are no credit to him, or the Society. The word *Mammon* does not signify "*Riches*," nor does *Hosanna* mean "*Glory to the Son of David*," as every tyro in Biblical literature is well aware, though the Professor defended what he did on the authority of "*the Bible Society's own authorised Bible*")\* till the "venerable old man was bowed to the very dust with self-abasement and distress; †" while the assertions, "*Jésus Christ est le vrai Dieu*," &c. because they were "headings," were no transgressions against the Society. It is impossible to read these proceedings, detailed, too, by the Society's warmest, best, and most eloquent friends, without deep indignation. It is impossible that those who really subscribed their money to furnish the Bible without note or comment, should not take deep offence at this contemptible verbal juggle, whereby a religionist may print what construction he pleases upon the text of Scripture, provided he confines his opinions to the headings of a page or chapter.

But let us now advert to Mr. Wilks's defence of this most gross and audacious insult, to the common understandings of the Society's subscribers.

The Society distributes innumerable copies of the Bible in the English tongue, with the translators' headings and marginal references, *which are a running annotation on the text*. I confess that this is a partial violation of the STRICT PRINCIPLE of there being neither NOTE NOR COMMENT: but it was admitted, under all the peculiar circumstances of the case, by all parties, by mutual compact; and, being well-defined and incapable of extension, no evil has arisen from this slight INFRINGEMENT of the abstract RULE. But, be this as it may, these NOTES and headings which the Society, in its corporate capacity, has so WIDELY CIRCULATED, vindicate for it the character of a strictly Trinitarian society. The only portion of human exposition which it publishes, is this orthodox COMMENT: a COMMENT so orthodox, that no Socinian, without tampering with his own conscience, can give to it his sanction. I need not refer your lordship to any particular passages for examples, as the whole volume abounds in them. Thus, over the very first chapter of St. John, we read, "The

\* Wilks, p. 95.

† Ibid.



divinity, humanity, and office of Jesus Christ," and so of scores of other passages. Our friends ask for a Trinitarian test; well then, we have one. Do they tell us, that it is not sufficient that the book itself is Trinitarian, unless those who unite to circulate it are so also; and that the Society ought to be open only to those, using the words of Mr. Gordon's motion, who believe in "a triune God." Well then, I repeat we have exactly such a society as our friends wish; for they do not desire that an individual pledge should be given by every member, but only that the regulations of the Society itself should be such, that a Socinian knowing them, cannot join it without dissimulation. Here then is precisely what they demand; the whole matter is prepared to their hands: we not only give the book, but we give a pledge that we construe it in an orthodox manner; and we have even VIOLATED the strict RULE of NO COMMENT in such a way, that no Socinian can feel comfortable in joining us, any more than he could if we adopted Mr. Gordon's resolution. I do not myself think a test necessary for the simple object of circulating the word of God; but if it be, here is one already in existence. *The member of the Bible Society, unless he protests against this heading, virtually says that the first chapter of St. John's Gospel inculcates "the divinity, humanity, and office of Jesus Christ."* What would our friends have more? Is not this lawful? I do not mean, indeed, that any member pledges himself to all the headings and marginal notes of the authorised English translation, merely because he is content, upon the whole, that the copies should go forth as usually printed; [what does he mean?] there is no such compromise: many excellent persons in the Society may not like all these ANNOTATIONS, but at the same time I see not how any person who adopted the doctrines of Socinianism could honestly tolerate them. I AGAIN ADMIT that this is a BREACH of the treaty of strict NEUTRALITY, but I DO NOT REGRET IT (!!!); but whether it be wise or unwise, it is at least a proof that the institution is not Anti-trinitarian, even if the circulation of the simple text itself, faithfully translated, were not pledge sufficient.

Here we have a REPEATED ADMISSION, that the headings are "NOTES AND COMMENTS;" a "*violation of the strict principle of there being neither note nor comment*;" and "*a breach of the treaty of strict neutrality*." And all this from the pen of a man, who says "*at once and UNEQUIVOCALLY, that if the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, has, in any one instance, violated, or connived at the violation of, this fundamental rule, it is NO LONGER WORTHY OF PUBLIC CONFIDENCE!*" "NOT REGRET" that the Society he is defending "*is no longer worthy of public confidence!*" To restore the Society to that "confidence," of which it thus became "no longer worthy," the only defence on which Mr. Wilks could light, was "*the peculiar circumstances of the case.*" What these are, he deigns not to inform us. Their peculiarity is evidently not limited to the English Bible. He tells us these headings were admitted "*by all parties, by mutual compact.*" Where is the record of this compact to be found? He tells us further, that the violation was well defined, and incapable of extension." Where has the "definition" been given? As to its "*incapability of extension,*" the Lausanne Testament, and most of the European Bibles, may illustrate *that*; and further illustration may be derived from a transaction which we now proceed to notice.

A devoted missionary, travelling in Palestine, met with a Hebrew edition of the Bible, circulating by express directions of the Committee of the British and

Foreign Bible Society, which, being a Hebrew scholar, he rejoiced to find. To his deep concern and astonishment, however, on dipping at one occasion into the Songs of Solomon, he found them headed by an explanatory note—that these sacred and inspired writings of that anointed king of Israel, who was a type of our blessed Saviour, most probably were written in praise of some one of his concubines. P. 2.

And truly these headings are bad enough, if we are to judge from the specimen selected by the author of the letter. We will present our readers with a few :

Gen. i. "*Traditio de creatione!*"

Gen. ii. "*Alia traditio de creatione!!*"

Job i. "*Jobus virtutem suam à circutore in suspiciam adductam inter durissime mala tuetur.*"

Cant. i. "*Salomonis adulationes et impetus in virginis virtutem !!!*"

Does "the Member of the Bible Society, unless he protests against" these headings, "virtually" "endorse" them, as Mr. Wilks would say? Mr. Wilks amusingly endeavours to extenuate these abominations, by saying that *traditio* does not always mean *tradition*; what else it means in this passage he does not inform us. Speaking of the last cited heading, "I have much doubt," he says, "whether the word '*virtutem*' was intended to convey the idea which is meant to be attached to it in the Sackville-street papers. Its classical meaning is fortitude, constancy; not of necessity female modesty." It is true enough that the penman of these headings seems to have been no great classic; but if our readers can make any sense of the context with Mr. Wilks's interpretation of "*virtutem*," they have the advantage of us.

The Society's defence on this point, in the hands of Mr. Wilks, amounts to this. The Canstein Institution, at Halle, offered to the Society, in the year 1818, four thousand copies of Reineccius's Hebrew Bible. Of these the Society took one thousand. Reineccius's Bible was highly spoken of in various bibliographical works; and Dr. Knapp, the conductor of the Canstein Institution, was known to be opposed to Neology. But all this while Mr. Wilks is blinking the gravamen of the charge. It seems that the Bible Society, neither in this case, nor in any other, ever interfered with headings. The admission of headings they thought perfectly consistent with the exclusion of notes and comments; and according to the *best* case that can be made out in their favour.

It was not till after much painful experience, that the conductors of the Bible Society became fully aware of the necessity of scrupulously collating foreign copies of the Scriptures in such minute particulars as the *customary* headings of the chapters. Pp. 5, 6.

Thus these headings were not only considered "*customary*," but the Society gave itself no trouble about them, till the scandal of their toleration resounded throughout Europe. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge permits headings, notes, and comments; but

where shall we find anything approaching to this in the multitudinous range of that Society's publications? The answer is but one, and the reason is, the Society is *wholly* conducted by orthodox persons.

But we are here necessitated to suspend our pen. We hope in our next number to conclude our view of this interesting question which is daily developing, with increasing emphasis, the forebodings of those sagacious men who, from the first moment of the Society's existence, foresaw its ultimate position and consequences. How far Churchmen may think, after attentively weighing the merits of the question, they can conscientiously remain members of the Bible Society, must depend on varieties of opinion; but we do not believe that any *conscientious* man will be frightened by Mr. Wilks's threat.

If the issue should be (not that I fear it will be, when the question is clearly understood in all its bearings) that a large portion of the Clergy and Church members should retire, the Society will still exist and flourish; but it will be, and NOT UNFAIRLY (!) a focus for the concentration of Dissenting strength which may shake the Church to its foundations. P. 142.

We do not think that the results would reach this crisis: if they would, right must still be done; but we have no doubt that hostility to the Church would prevail sufficiently within the Society, though we do not agree with Mr. Wilks that it would be "*not unfairly*," since we are unfashionable enough to prefer the existence of our Church to the prosperity of the Bible Society. But let thoughtful Churchmen reflect upon this threat, and infer from it the character of a body who, *professing to have the SOLE OBJECT of circulating the Holy Scriptures without note or comment*, may, by the admission of an advocate, undertake to "shake the Church to its foundations."

---

ART. II. — *Reviewers Reviewed*: — *Edinburgh Review*. No. CVIII. January, 1832. Edinburgh: Black. London: Longman.

"THE present century has produced various biographies of English Prelates, all bearing one conspicuous mark of resemblance in the zeal and pertinacity with which they recommend to the admiration or acquiescence of mankind, all that has been done, and taught, and established by the Church. The Church of Rome is infallible; and the Church of England never errs: which, if not in the abstract, at least, in the concrete, amounts to nearly the same thing." *Edinburgh Review*. No. CVIII. p. 312.

"Soon after his consecration, he (Cranmer) addressed to the king a letter, in which he zealously urged the necessity of bringing this important question (of the divorce) to a determination: and as the pious monarch had already been declared the head of the Church of England, he had no hesitation in returning an answer; which, says the biographer, 'was in perfect accordance with the Primate's suggestion, in which he forgot not to maintain the *supremacy he had lately recovered*.' Of the origin and progress of the anomalous, and we will venture to add the absurd, maxim, that the king is the head of the Church, this may be considered as rather a curious account; for in what sense could Henry VIII. be said to recover a right or prerogative which had never been possessed by him or any of his predecessors?" *Ibid*. p. 318.

"According to the canon law, marriage, which is one of the seven Sacraments, cannot be dissolved by any course of judicial procedure; and we may here remark in passing, that although the modern law of England does not professedly adhere to this notion of a Sacrament, it is not completely disentangled from the ancient superstition: the ecclesiastical courts may declare a marriage to have been invalid from the beginning, but they cannot dissolve the sacred bond of matrimony. We order these things better in Scotland, where marriage is considered as a civil contract, although it is generally accompanied with a religious sanction." *Ibid.* p. 319.

"It was in a great measure owing to his (Cranmer's) exertions, that the reformation of the Church of England was nearly advanced to that point where it still rests. That this reformation should have been left so incomplete, is less surprising than that it should scarcely have been resumed for 250 years. The most essential trappings of a proud popish prelacy were left uncuttailed, nor was the Church sufficiently purified from popish devices and observances. The papists enumerate seven Sacraments; namely, baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, holy order, and matrimony. Of these the Church of England has nominally retained two; but some others still linger under the shade of ancient superstition. Marriage, instead of being considered as a civil contract, retains a great portion of its former veneration as one of the seven: and confirmation, a popish and unscriptural rite, is still in fresh observance, although no longer described as a Sacrament. . . . . Mr. Todd proceeds to utter some of the traditionary jargon about the *apostolical* institution of episcopacy. If in any book written by the apostles, or during the apostolical age, he can point out a passage, which, either directly or by implication, sanctions the government of the Church by Archbishops and Bishops, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons and Chancellors, we shall then be ready to admit, that the two Archbishops, and the twenty-four Bishops, driving with their stately equipages to Westminster, and, by virtue of their temporal baronies, taking their seats in the House of Lords, are the legitimate successors and representatives of those men, lowly in their outward form, but full of the Holy Ghost, who received the divine commission to go and teach all nations. According to this superannuated bigotry, a Church without Bishops is no Church. If all Presbyters had been denominated Bishops, would this substitution of one name for another have removed the impediment? The doctrine of the Apostolicals is, that there has been a perpetual succession of Bishops from the time of the Apostles to that of their representatives in Spain, England, Ireland, and other favoured countries; and that the influence of the Holy Spirit has thus been transmitted from one array of Bishops to another, through all the vicissitudes of eighteen centuries. The foul and polluted influence through which this divine influence must so long have continued to flow, seems to occasion as little difficulty to the English, as to the Spanish Apostolicals. This is but one degree better than transubstantiation; and to a man of sound understanding, unsubdued by early prejudice, it is just as easy to believe that the Bishop of Rome is the lawful successor of St. Peter. . . . . It is not by arrogating to themselves the divine favour, and excluding other Churches from all participation of it, that the champions of the English hierarchy will best consult the credit and advancement of their own establishment; in which the idle splendour of one class of ecclesiastics is placed in so indecent a contrast with the laborious poverty of another. As the taste for describing their Church as *apostolical*, seems to have been recently revived, we will venture to suggest, that in the present state of public sentiment, the practice can be attended with no possible benefit. In Spain the direful tribunal of the Inquisition, was regularly described as *apostolical*; and we hear of such a public functionary as the *Inquisidor Apostolico* de Arragon: but in Spain there were no Dissenters from the Established Church, and no newspapers or reviews, that deserve the name." *Ibid.* p. 325.

"The proceedings against Strafford are justified in our opinion, by that which alone justifies capital punishment or any punishment,—by that which alone

justifies war,—by the public danger. That there is a certain amount of public danger, which will justify a legislature in sentencing a man to death by an *ex post facto* law, few people we suppose will deny. Few people, for example, will deny that the French Convention was perfectly justified in declaring Robespierre, St. Just, and Couthon, *hors de loi* without a trial. This proceeding differed from the proceeding against Strafford, only in being much more rapid and violent. Strafford was fully heard. Robespierre was not suffered to defend himself. Was there, then, in the case of Strafford, a danger sufficient to justify an act of attainder? We believe that there was. We believe that the contest, in which the parliament was engaged against the king, was a contest for the security of our property,—for the liberty of our persons,—for every thing, which makes us to differ from the subjects of Don Miguel. We believe that the cause of the commons was such as justified them in resisting the king, in raising an army, in sending thousands of brave men to kill and to be killed. An act of attainder is surely not more a departure from the ordinary course of law, than a civil war. An act of attainder produces much less suffering than a civil war; and we are, therefore, unable to discover on what principle it can be maintained—that a cause which justifies a civil war, will not justify an act of attainder." *Ibid.* p. 533.

This is a fine specimen of the political, moral, and religious philosophy, which is, from time to time, prepared for the instruction of the readers of the Edinburgh Review. Great, unquestionably, have been the power and the success with which the conductors of that Review have laboured in perverting the public sentiment, and rendering the people indifferent and disaffected to the institutions of the country; but their triumph has not yet been so complete, as to give an undisputed sanction to all their dogmas, and to enable them to pass without examination or remark. Men are perhaps not yet prepared to agree with the Edinburgh Reviewers on the doctrine of the king's supremacy, on the occasional experience of acts of attainder, the apostolical authority and descent of episcopacy, the permanent obligation of the marriage contract, or the equal infallibility of the churches of England and of Rome.

It is with the most dignified complacency that the writer speaks "of the anomalous, and we will venture to add very absurd, maxim, that the king is the head of the Church." The Papist naturally objects to the doctrine of the king's supremacy, because it excludes the supremacy of the pope: the Dissenter, because he admits no head but Christ. We have never been able to agree in the sufficiency of the latter objection. We acknowledge, without the least reservation, that Christ is the Head of the whole Church; but in respect of the particular Church, as of the realm of England, we conceive the doctrine of the king's supremacy to be founded in a negation of the pope's supremacy; in a declaration, that the king and his dominions are independent of any foreign jurisdiction; and that whatever authority was formerly exercised by the pope, is now vested in the king, reigning and ruling according to the law. "The oath of supremacy is principally calculated as a renunciation of the pope's pretended authority," 1 Blackstone, 368.

We pretend not to any extraordinary acquaintance with the history of the country and its civil and religious constitution; but we have always been disposed to the opinion, that before the Norman Conquest, the Church of England was independent of foreign jurisdiction, and that if the king's supremacy was not then formally asserted, it was because it was not disputed. After the conquest, attempts were made to introduce the foreign jurisdiction, and to set up the supremacy of the pope; and these attempts were resisted by the native spirit of our institutions, and by the independence of the barons and prelates who had been trained under these institutions; and they were not successful until the weakness of the prince succumbed to the ambition of the foreign and regular clergy. The supremacy of the pope, which was thus obtained, betrayed itself in various encroachments on the proper rights of the sovereign; and when Henry VIII. recovered this supremacy, he declared it chiefly in resuming the rights which had been invaded: and the arbitrary power, which seems to have identified itself with the supremacy under the Tudors and the Stuarts, and to have mainly contributed to the unpopularity of the doctrine, was restrained at the revolution, when the power of the sovereign was limited by law. This is the view which we have always been disposed to take of the king's supremacy, and we think that it is agreeable to the course of English history, and to the spirit of the laws passed at the reformation, especially the preamble of the Act 24 Hen. VIII. c. 12. which recites, that the crown of England is independent, and that all classes of men, whether of the spirituality or temporality, owe obedience to it; that the Church of England has been accustomed to exercise jurisdiction in courts spiritual; and that the encroachments of the Bishop of Rome had been checked by the king's renowned progenitors. We cannot see how this doctrine of the king's supremacy is an "anomalous" or very "absurd" maxim, or that there is any occasion for doubting, in what sense Henry could be said to recover a right, which had never been possessed by him, or any of his predecessors. "If we are right in the view which we have taken of the king's supremacy, though we wish not to contend for a word, we cannot conceive a more appropriate term than *recovery* for the resumption of rights, inherent in the royal sovereignty of Henry VIII. of which his predecessors had been despoiled; and although the Edinburgh Review affects to call it "rather a curious account" which is given by Mr. Todd, they will find an equally "curious account" in the Commentaries on the Laws of England. "The reformation of religion under Henry VIII. offers an entirely new scene in ecclesiastical matters; the usurped power of the pope being now for ever routed and destroyed; all his connexions with this island cut off; the crown *restored* to its supremacy over spiritual men and causes; and the patronage of bishoprics being once

more indisputably vested in the king. And had the spiritual courts been at this time re-united to the civil, we should have seen the old Saxon constitution, with regard to ecclesiastical polity, completely restored." 4 Blackstone, p. 430.

While the commentaries are open before us, we wish to refer to the doctrine of attainder, without taking any other notice of the circumstances of the Earl of Strafford's attainder, than reciting a part of the preamble of the act for reversing his attainder, 13 and 14 Charles II. c. 29. in which it is stated, that the earl "made a particular defence to every article objected against him, insomuch that the turbulent party, seeing no hopes to effect their unjust designs by any ordinary way and method of proceeding, did at last resolve to attempt the destruction and attainder of the said earl, by an act of parliament to be therefore purposely made to condemn him upon accumulative treason, none of the pretended crimes being treason apart, and so could not be in the whole, if they had been proved, as they were not." This is not a very favourable account, which an unrepealed statute exhibits of a particular act of attainder, *therefore purposely made to condemn* its object. The Edinburgh Reviewer, however, lays down the broad proposition: "That there is a certain amount of public danger, which will justify a legislature in sentencing a man to death by an ex-post-facto law, few people we suppose will deny." This is assuming the concurrence of the multitude in a very sanguinary and atrocious doctrine: it is charging a christian people with approving a revival of the exploded heathenism of proscription and tyrannicide; for "sentencing a man to death by an ex-post-facto law," not for any crime, but in consideration of the public danger, is neither more nor less than an act of deliberate murder, and each of the persons conspiring in this act, is as guilty of murder as if he individually applied the dagger of the assassin. The Reviewer very quietly passes over the question of the competence of the parties, who are to measure the amount of public danger, which is to justify this murderous sentence, whether Pompey is to be the judge of the proceedings of Sylla, or Sylla of those of Pompey, whether Brutus is to be the arbiter of the destinies of Cæsar, or Cæsar of those of Brutus, and whether some error may not creep into the estimate of public danger, from the private prejudices and passions and interests of the judge. "An act of attainder is surely not more a departure from the ordinary course of the law than a civil war; and we are therefore unable to discover on what principle it can be maintained, that a cause which justifies a civil war will not justify an act of attainder." Circumstances, and the violence of faction, may render a civil war unavoidable; but it is an extraordinary cause which justifies a civil war: and it is a saying of proverbial wisdom, that it is nothing but the successful issue of revolution, which takes away its treason. But the



Reviewer believes that the great rebellion was justified ; and therefore the attainder of Strafford was justified : and what objection remains to the execution of Charles ? The movers of the rebellion had the power to judge of the amount of public danger, and to act according to their judgment : and it was the same sense, real or imaginary, of the public danger, supported by the same possession of power, which, at a later period, led to the execution of Russell and Sidney. Were these acts also justified ? The country is now agitated by the discussion of a great question, from which, as it is carried or rejected, men of different parties anticipate the most imminent danger to the country : now what would be thought of an enactment to this effect ; "Whereas, the question of Parliamentary Reform is fraught with public danger, and Thomas Babington Macauley, Esq. by the zeal and talent with which he maintains the rights of the people, may excite the said people to a civil war for the possession of those rights ; be it enacted for the prevention of the said public danger of civil war, That the said T. B. Macauley, Esq. be hanged by the neck, &c." Such an enactment might try the principles, while it alarmed the fears of the Edinburgh Reviewer, and yet would it be more than a justified act of the legislature, sentencing a man to death by an ex-post-facto law, in consideration of a certain amount of public danger ? But there are other lawyers than those of the Edinburgh Review. Blackstone argues upon the unreasonableness of making laws ex-post-facto, "when after an act indifferent in itself is committed, the legislature then, for the first time, declares it to have been a crime, and inflicts a punishment upon the person who has committed it. Here it is impossible that the person could foresee that an action innocent when it was done, should be afterwards converted to guilt by a subsequent law : he had therefore no cause to abstain from it ; and all punishment for not abstaining, must of consequence be cruel and unjust." 1 Blackstone, p. 46. If *all* such punishment be cruel and unjust, what must be thought of sentencing a man to death ? Mr. Christian remarks, upon this passage of the Commentator : "An ex-post-facto law may be either of a public or a private nature ; when we speak generally of an ex-post-facto law, we perhaps always mean a law which comprehends the whole community. The Roman *privilegia* seem to correspond to our bills of attainder, and bills of pains and penalties ; which, though in their nature they are ex-post-facto laws, are seldom called so." Mr. Christian was led to the notice of the Roman *privilegia*, by a passage of Cicero, to which the learned commentator appeals in support of his argument ; and it is not only a matter of curiosity to know the opinion of the Roman orator on these *privilegia*, or bills of attainder, but his opinion derives authority from his personal acquaintance both with bills of attainder and with civil war. We quote from the edition

of Ernesti: "Tum leges præclarissimæ de XII tabulis tralatæ duo: quarum altera privilegia tollit; altera de capite civis rogari, nisi minimo comitiatu vetat; nondum initis seditiosis tribunis plebis, ne cogitatis quidem, admirandum, tantum majores in posterum providisse: in privos homines leges ferri noluerunt; id enim est privilegium; quo quid est injustius? cum legis hæc vis sit, scitum esse jussum in omnes? ferri de singulis nisi centuriatis comitiis noluerunt: descriptus enim populus censu, ordinibus, ætatibus, plus adhibet ad suffragium consilii, quam fusè in tribus convocatus. Quo verius in nostrâ causâ vir magni ingenii, summæque prudentiâ, L. Cotta dicebat, nihil omnino actum esse de nobis: præter enim quam quod comitia illa essent armis gesta servilibus, præterea neque tributa capitis comitia rata esse possunt, neque ulla privilegii: quocirca nihil nobis opus esse lege, de quibus nihil omnino actum esset legibus." *De Legibus*, III. 19. Again, he says: "Quo jure, quo more, quo exemplo, legem nominatim de capite civis indemnati tulisti? Vetant leges sacratæ, vetant XII. tabulæ, leges privis hominibus irrogari; id est enim privilegium: nemo unquam tulit; nihil est crudelius, nihil perniciosius, nihil quod minus hæc civitas ferre possit. Proscriptionis miserrimum nomen illud, et omnis acerbitas Sullani temporis quid habet, quod maxime est insigne ad memoriam crudelitatis? opinor, pœnam in civis Romanos nominatim sine judicio constitutam. Hanc igitur, pontifices, judicio atque autoritate vestrâ tribuno plebis potestatem dabit, ut proscribere possit, quos velit? Quæro enim, quid sit aliud, proscribere? Velitis, jubeatis, ut M. Tullius in civitate ne sit, bonaque ejus ut mea sint." *Pro Domo*, 17. FEW PEOPLE, as we venture to suppose, will have much difficulty in choosing, whether they will subscribe to the opinions of the Edinburgh Review on sentencing a man to death by an ex-post-facto law, or to those of Blackstone, Christian, and Cicero, on the unreasonableness, the injustice, and the cruelty of bills of attainder.

It is a pity to be obliged to spoil the ecclesiastical as well as the political theories of the Edinburgh Review; but the vulgar virulence with which episcopacy is assailed, and the conceit with which the wisdom of the nineteenth century is called to revolt from *such things as Bishops*, requires that a stand should be made in defence of the constitution of the Church, and that some of the arts with which it is attacked should be enforced. We have been taught and accustomed to hold the very highest notion of the Divine institution of Episcopacy, and of the apostolical succession, or the tradition from the apostles through their successors, of authority to minister in the Church: we say, *authority*, which it was the office of apostolical men to convey, and not *grace*, which it is in the power of God alone to bestow. This apostolical succession is held in the Romish Church, to the exclusion of all Protestants, although the validity of the English ordinations in this respect

was powerfully vindicated by the learned Courayer, in a work which exposed him to the persecution of his own Church; and for which he received the degree of D.D. from the University of Oxford. It is also held in the Greek Church, and in the Protestant Episcopal Churches of England and Ireland, of Scotland, and of America; its want is felt and acknowledged in some of the Lutheran Churches on the Continent, and was the principle of Grabe's attachment to the Church of England: and even such of the Dissenters as admit the laying on of the hands of the Presbyters, can hardly deny the succession of Presbyterian power. It is easy for the Edinburgh Reviewer to talk of "the traditionary jargon about the *apostolical* institution of episcopacy;" but have his researches in ecclesiastical history enabled him to refute this jargon, or to define the period in which episcopacy was surreptitiously introduced, in which there was no episcopacy, and no three-fold division of the Christian ministry? Let him try his strength with the Scotch Bishop Skinner's "Primitive Truth and Order," or with any other unanswered or unanswerable defences of episcopacy. The Reviewer, indeed, promises, that "if in any book written by the apostles, or during the apostolical age, there can be pointed out a passage, which either directly or by implication sanctions the government of the Church by Archbishops and Bishops, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons and Chancellors," he will admit the present hierarchy to be the successors and representatives of the apostles: but let him state who of the approved defenders of the Church has maintained this doctrine? not surely Dodwell, Hicks, or any of the nonjurors who adhered to the deposed Bishops, and called for *Bishops without baronies*; not Bishop Hobart in America; not the distinguished family of the Skinners, or any of their coadjutors in Scotland, from Bishop Sage to Bishop Gleig; nor Baitt, nor Maurice, nor Hammond, nor Potter, nor any of the giant divines of England. He calls it "superannuated bigotry," to say that a Church without Bishops is no Church; and yet this is not only the practical principle of the Catholic Church throughout the world, but the very doctrine and language of the apostolical age, to which in the preceding sentence he offers to defer. He asks, "If all Presbyters had been denominated Bishops, would the substitution of one name for another have removed the impediment?" But does he need to be informed, that in the New Testament, Bishops and Presbyters are convertible terms, and that the authority of episcopacy rests on the distinction not of a name or title, which has undergone many alterations, but of an order and an office which has always been peculiar. With the same discrimination he calls the defenders of episcopacy *apostolicals*, and confounds them with the Spanish *apostolicals*, who derive their name from upholding the apostolicity of the whole

system of the Church of Rome. He undertakes to warn the champions of the English hierarchy, whose "taste for describing their Church as apostolical seems to have been recently revived," (and we would that it had never failed), that "the practice can be attended with no possible benefit;" and to this we answer, that, whatever in the doctrine or discipline of the Church is of apostolical origin and descent, whether it be defended or undefended, will survive the attacks of all the "newspapers and reviews that deserve the name," and that the erastianism and indifference which the Edinburgh Reviewer recommends, have no solid foundation of perpetuity; and that the sects which have been most ready to adopt them, have had the quickest experience of their instability. Protestantism, Episcopacy, and Christianity, are older than the Edinburgh Review.

If the Edinburgh Reviewer would have taken the trouble of examining Mr. Morgan's *Doctrine and Law of Marriage, Adultery and Divorce*, which Mr. Todd's pages commended to his notice, he might have been better acquainted with the subject which he treats so superciliously: he might, at least, have learned the difference between the doctrines and language held in the Churches of England and of Rome, in respect of marriage; he might have known that the one falsely attributes to it a sacramental character, and thence it infers its perpetuity; and that the other venerates it as a divine institution for the good of mankind; and in conformity with that institution and purpose, and with the express language of the Scriptures, maintains its permanent and indissoluble obligation, which is also recognized by the ordinary law of the land, and only violated by the anomaly of an *ex-post-facto*. From the same work he might have learned that these things are not ordered better in Scotland, where the merely civil contract of marriage is in one case as hard to be proved, as in another it is easy to be dissolved. The famous case of *Dalrymple v. Dalrymple*, is a poor testimony of the law of marriage in Scotland.

But it has become the idiom, we had nearly said the idiotism of a party, to assert that the Church of England is in nothing better than the Church of Rome. "The most essential trappings of a proud popish Prelacy were left uncurtailed at the Reformation:" if this is meant of the wealth of the Church, Sir James Mackintosh may teach the reviewer, that a fifth or a fourth part of the landed property of England, then held by ecclesiastics, was confiscated in the space of five years: if it is meant of the power of the Bishops in Parliament, from which the Edinburgh reviewer would not grieve to exclude them; it should be remembered, that at the time of the Reformation, the ranks of the Peerage had been thinned by the wars of the Roses, and the spiritual Peers formed a moiety, if not a majority of the House, of which they now constitute hardly the sixteenth part; and there surely

never was a period, in which there was less occasion to charge the Bishops of the Church of England with "the trappings of a proud popish Prelacy." The Reformation may not have been carried to the extent which was intended, or which may yet be desired. The spirit in which the reviewer speaks of matters of ecclesiastical polity, and especially of confirmation, (on which we would advise him to read any approved commentary upon Heb. vi. 2. before he again calls it "a popish and unscriptural rite,") proves his incompetence to judge of the progress and necessity of a Reformation. We are no apologists of errors and abuses in the Church; we have no prejudice against a just and necessary reform: but we remember how well the reformers did their task, and how little they left to be done; how wisely they restored to the people the knowledge of the Scriptures, and the liberty of worshipping God in their own tongue; how much they rejected, and how little they retained of what was contrary to the Scriptures, AND the practice of the primitive Church: and it is not true that nothing has since been done. The authorized version of the Bible is the imperishable memorial of the sacred learning of the reign of James I.; the liturgy was revised after the restoration; a further revisal of the liturgy, with a scheme of comprehension, was attempted at the revolution; the condition of the Bishops and inferior Clergy was improved, and some large parishes divided, and new Churches erected, in the reign of Queen Anne: and if some measures have proved abortive, and others have not been attempted, the fault may in some degree be ascribed to a keen sense of the jealousy of Catholics and Dissenters; and, favourable as we have always been to just concession and reform, we are constrained to ask, what but an increase of hostility has followed the repeal of the restrictions upon the Unitarians, the Catholics, and the Protestant Dissenters?

Many of the writers, whose names and talents have given *eclat* to the Edinburgh Review, have lately been raised to high rank and office under the crown. We hardly need to name Mr. Brougham, Mr. Jeffrey, Sir James Mackintosh, Mr. Macaulay, and others. Is it not possible that those writers begin to experience, that the noise and the bustle, which are suited to opposition, are not equally adapted to the high responsibility of ministers of state; that they want the power to control the popular passions and love of change, which they have themselves excited; and to restore the affections of the people, to the institutions which they have taught them to depreciate, and which they are themselves now called to defend? But if they have now any control over the pages which their talents have raised to oracular eminence with their party; may they not give occasional hints to their young reviewers, to mix some little wisdom with their wit; to deal in something more valuable than antithesis, and point, and sarcasm; and to

remember, that with or without the will of the Edinburgh reviewers, England is still a Christian country, its specific creed and formularies are all Protestant, its Church is in alliance with the State, its laws are founded in justice to the community, and to individuals, and its king is, in all causes and over all people, ecclesiastical as well as civil, within his dominions, supreme?

---

## LITERARY REPORT.

---

*The Confessions of a Member of the Church of England, occasioned by a laborious Examination of the celebrated Work of the late Rev. WILLIAM JONES, entitled, "The Catholic Doctrine of a Trinity." And also, A brief Essay on Socinianism.* London: Marshall & Miller. 1830. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 221.

FROM a perusal of the *Introduction* to this volume, we learn that it is the production of a Mr. Shaw, of Bath, whose signature proclaims him to be its author. Why not manfully place his name in the *title page*? We have no intention of dragging our readers through this covert attack upon the fundamental doctrines of Christianity; for, as there is nothing new in the objections of Mr. Shaw, so there could be little of interest or of instruction in the refutation of his stale heresies. And what, though the Defence of "the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity," against which our author would be supposed to direct his assault, and through the sides of which, he dares to impugn the faith of our venerable Church, be found defective, and justly obnoxious to condemnation? we are "not careful" to answer for its integrity, building our creed upon the word of God alone, as the one touchstone of truth!

Mr. Shaw writes forsooth of "the love which he bears towards the Church of England; he entertains a hope that his labours may "tend to its advantage;" he believes it to be "the best church of the present day." He reminds us of our old friend, Isaac Walton, who, with infinite naiveté,

instructs his pupils to handle the writhing worms, about to be fixed upon their fishing-hooks, "*tenderly, as if they loved them.*" And we take this opportunity of remarking, that our author is one amongst ten thousand examples, confirmatory of the unquestionable fact, that noisy advocates for *Ecclesiastical Reform* are animated with distaste for the doctrines, whilst they would wish to be considered as hostile chiefly to the discipline of the Church.

We confess that we know nothing of the author of the work before us; but we *do* know that he is guilty of a disingenuous misnomer, when he ventures to describe himself as "*a member of the Church of England,*" with the Articles, the Creeds, the Liturgy, and the Homilies of which, he is at open war! We acknowledge our indignation at this assumption of a name, under whose treacherous and convenient disguise the characteristic doctrines of our holy Church are utterly denied, whilst, by these contemptible tricks, the infidel and the dissenter are furnished with weapons of attack against the very foundations of our Sion, from the armoury of such as falsely boast themselves her sons! Lovers of naked truth, we think it a solemn matter of duty, to enter our protest against these fraudulent impositions, which deceive the unwary, and give occasion to the sarcastic revilers of our ecclesiastical establishment to iterate the memorable taunt, that the members of our communion, "reprobate in the closet what they read in the Church."\*

\* Gibbon's *Memoirs*, p. 240.

We cordially detest every species of juggling imposture, and we instinctively shrink from the hollow embraces of the assassin, who flatters us with his lips, and would at the same time plant his dagger in our hearts! "Betrayest thou me with a kiss?" is the query, with which we would repudiate these protestations of affection; and we would hold no intercourse, even as reviewers, with an author writing under a false name, as we would outlaw the pirate, fighting under false colours. "The Confessions of a member of the Church of England," forsooth! "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" "Much may be guessed at the man and his book."—"What depth there is, by the framing of his title—hung out like a tolling signpost to call passengers. A surer sign of his lost shame he could not have given, than seeking thus unseasonably to prepossess men BY A FALSE NAME. And seeing he hath neither kept his word in the sequel, nor omitted any kind of boldness in slandering, it is manifest his purpose was only to rub the forehead of his title with this ASSUMPTION OF A NAME, that he might not want colour to be the more impudent throughout his whole CONFESSIONS."\*

*The Gospel Miracles; in a Series of Poetical Sketches; with Illustrative Conversations.* By RICHARD MANT, D. D. M. R. I. A. *Lord Bishop of Down and Connor.* London. Rivingtons, 1832. 12mo. Pp. xi. 254.

In the conversations attached to these sketches consists, in our opinion, the most valuable portion of the book. They illustrate, in an easy and familiar way, the scriptural, geographical, and incidental allusions in the several miracles of our blessed Lord recorded in the Gospel, which the sketches themselves are intended to pourtray. There is nothing, however, very striking or impressive in the poetry; which is chiefly interesting as marking the devotional feelings of the writer's mind.

\* Milton's Apology for Smectymnus. Polit. Works, vol. iii. p. 172. Edit. Amsterdam, A. D. 1698.

and his earnest wish to impart some portion of it to his readers. As a fair specimen of the whole, we select the stanzas on the raising of the widow's son.

We are somewhat fastidious, perhaps, having perused and re-perused Dale's beautiful poem on the same subject; and we shall therefore leave our readers to play the minute critic themselves. The bishop is unquestionably a highly gifted scholar, and a sound divine; but *non omnia possumus omnes*. It is not denied, indeed, that his verses are respectable; but we expect something far above mediocrity from Bishop Mant.

## THE WIDOW'S SON.

Yield the way, give ample space;  
Lo! it comes through Nain's gate:  
Give the sad procession place,  
Moving in funeral state,  
There in Death's attire array'd,  
One in prime of youth is laid:  
And a mournful matron near  
Paces by the burial bier.

With maternal anguish wild,  
In affliction's darkest mood,  
'Tis the mother mourns her child,  
Rest from her in widowhood.  
'Tis the mother mourns her son,  
Him her last and only one:  
Well may she her sorrow rue,  
Husbandless, and childless too!

Many a lonely year of grief,  
Thro' the livelong night and day  
He has been her sole relief,  
He has been her only stay.  
What of joy her heart has known,  
Center'd all in him alone;  
Parent, husband, daughter, son,  
All together wrapt in one.

All surviv'd in him alone,  
All in him alone are dead!  
In one ruin overthrown,  
Life's last charities are fled.  
What, alas! is left for her,  
But in yonder sepulchre,  
Where her earthly hopes shall lie,  
There to lay her down and die?

"Weep not!" Hark! a voice I hear  
Issuing from another throng,  
Which to Nain's city near  
Moves Capernaum's road along.  
There is one of gentle mien,  
Who, on yon funeral scene  
Gazing with benignant eyes,  
"Weep not!" to the mourner cries.



Who is he that boldly bids  
Tears of grief their station keep,  
Fent within the bursting lids !  
'Twere as easy task from sleep  
To recall that corpse again ;  
And along the blacken'd vein  
Bid, with renovated glow,  
Life's empurpled current flow.

'Twere as easy !—Lo, a hand  
Softly rests upon the bier !  
Still the attentive bearers stand ;  
Hark, again the voice I hear :  
" Youth, I say to thee arise !"  
Quickly as the mandate flies,  
Fresh with life the nerves are strung,  
Beam the eyes, and speaks the tongue.

Now, lorn mother, weep no more :  
Or, if starting to the eye  
Tears will thence spontaneous pour,  
Be they tears of ecstasy !  
In thy desolate embrace  
See the kind Deliverer place  
Him, whom he from death hath won ;  
Him, thy dead, thy living son !

Take him, he is thine again !  
Let him to thy bosom grow,  
There thy child with transport strain,  
Such as thou alone canst know.

There the silent thoughts that swell  
To the Saviour's eye shall tell,  
More than language can express,  
All thy depth of thankfulness.

We meanwhile, whose lighter heart  
Less o'erwhelming joys possess,  
We will bear a louder part,  
And thy Benefactor bless.

Blessings on our Prophet light !  
Hail his deed of love and might !  
Blest be he whom God hath sent !  
Praise to God Omnipotent !

So from distant Galilee  
Shall the glorious tidings sound ;  
Tabor's mount, Tiberias' sea,  
Hence shall spread the marvel round.

Judah's hills shall hear the tale ;  
And her towns our PROPHET hail,  
At whose bidding sorrow flies,  
Death is foil'd, the dead arise !

*Sermons preached at the Temple Church  
by the Rev. W. H. ROWLATT, M.A.,  
Reader at the Temple, and domestic  
Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lady  
Gifford. Rivingtons. Pp. xii. 418.  
8vo.*

THIS is a valuable collection of sound practical sermons, and highly creditable to the author, who has evidently devoted much of his time to the study of his profession. If we have any objections to offer to the

positions laid down by Mr. Rowlatt, it is when he apparently advocates the doctrines of expediency, and farther concessions to the spirit of popery. With his views upon this subject it is impossible for us ever to coincide. Every day convinces us that concession has already gone too far ; and that unless a stand, at once determined and immediate, be made against the encroachments of the enemies of our Established Church, she will inevitably become a victim to their implacable hostility, and unceasing machinations. We trust that these sentiments will not subject us to the charge of intolerance, as such is by no means our spirit. As watchmen of the Church, however, we dare not slumber whilst the enemy is abroad.

*The Missionary Spirit : introductory to the Course of Monthly Lectures, established by the Bishop and the Clergy of Boston and the Vicinity, to be denominated The Episcopal Missionary Lecture ; delivered in Christ Church, Boston, on the Evening of Advent Sunday, Nov. 27, 1831. By GEORGE W. DOANE, M.A. Rector of Trinity Church. Boston : Stimpson & Clapp. Pp. 34.*

It is always gratifying to us to notice the labours of our brethren in America, especially, when, as in the present instance, they are directed to the extension of pure religion and virtue. Mr. Doane is unquestionably a writer of great power ; and, what is of more value, a right-thinking man. The Missionary spirit displayed by him, is that which actuates our two admirable Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and the Propagation of the Gospel ; not that bitter feeling of sectarianism and exclusiveness which has rendered the term Missionary suspected, both in this country and our colonies ; and, consequently, his testimony to the intrinsic merits of our venerable Church, is highly acceptable, and expressed in a manner that cannot fail to please our readers. He is pointing out the various subjects which may form the texts of succeeding lectures ; and amongst them adverts to " the worthies of that blessed Communion, the good old Church of England,

to which, under God, we are so much indebted; the labours of her two venerable Societies, gaining for her the deserved praise of being the Mission Church of the whole world!" p. 21.

We wish more of such feeling prevailed at home. The Church, however, is built upon a rock, and we will not fear.

*An Address to the Females of Great Britain. By an ENGLISHWOMAN.*  
London: J. G. and F. Rivington.  
1832. 8vo. Pp. 15.

WILLINGLY would we have devoted a considerable space to this admirable specimen of virtuous feeling, sensible advice, and devoted attachment to the pure and holy doctrine of the Church of England. Our limits, however, forbid a more lengthened extract than the subjoined affectionate appeal, which must, therefore, be taken as a fair sample of the entire production. The amiable authoress is already well known by a "Life of Cranmer," and other popular compositions; nor will the present address detract from her well-earned distinction.

"But destroy the Clergy—bring them into utter contempt and hatred! Are there no tender associations, no sweet recollections connected with their remembrance, which will not force you to shed the tear of bitter regret, and induce you to mourn that such feelings are to be felt no more? Does no one recall the sensations attendant on that important moment, when, in the presence of an assembled multitude, she made a public acknowledgment of her faith; and, under the strengthening hand of a chief minister of the Church, listened to the solemn blessing that he pronounced? Does no one recall the mingled feelings of bliss and apprehension, of awe and delight, when she again knelt on the steps of that altar, and heard herself given to Him who was more than life to her, by ties which death alone could dissolve? Does no one recall the sweet tears that were shed on her new-born babe, when yet, weak from suffering, she received it again from the hands of that same minister, no longer "the heir of wrath," but "the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven?" Does no one recall the holy comfort imparted

by that same voice, when the shadows of death seemed to compass her round, and darkness and the grave appeared ready to swallow her up; when she was taught to grow strong under the injunction to leave her orphan children to God, for that he would protect them? Or does she forget when, surrounded by a grateful and smiling family, she entered the courts of the Lord's house, to return thanks for her unlooked-for recovery? Does recollection bring to no one the sad and sorrowful hour of anguish, when she would "utterly have fainted," had not the same revered lips which had consigned "earth to earth, ashes to ashes," the form so dear to her, breathed, in patience and holy tenderness, those arguments of submission to the will of Heaven, and brought to her memory those holy promises of protection, which made "light to spring up in darkness," and caused the widow's heart to sing for joy, in the very midst of misery and bereavement? Has no healing of feud been the work of the man of peace? Has no estranged heart been brought back, by his means, to the sanctified home from which it strayed? Has no prodigal been induced to 'go to his father,' and own his sin, nor fond mother wept over her recovered treasure, when she saw him who was lost, restored, and clad in the rich garments of reconciled and parental love?"

*Reports of the Board of Managers of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society, with an Introduction and Appendix.*  
Philadelphia: Printed for the Society. London: Miller. 8vo. Pp. x. 48.

THIS Report is eminently calculated for the instruction of the gentlemen of the Anti-slavery Society, to whom we earnestly recommend it; as the zeal of the emancipationists in America, is tempered by that prudence and experience which are so lamentably wanting in the declaimers of Aldermanbury and Exeter Hall. The account of the Colony of Liberia is at once interesting and gratifying; and the plan of its institution is characterised by sound sense, and a perfect knowledge of the condition and prospects of its future denizens.

## SERMON FOR TRINITY SUNDAY.

*On the Thirty-second Outline (Second Edition; Thirty-one of First Edition) in the Rev. H. Thompson's "Pastoralia."*

MATT. XXVIII. 19.

*Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

THE text contains the charge of our Lord to his apostles. They are commanded to bring by baptism into his religion all nations—the whole world. All are to be baptized in the name—or more properly, into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. That is, all are to be brought, by the outward sign of baptism, into the religion of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. It is the commission which runs to all Christ's ministers to the end of time,—to all generations as well as all nations. It is the faith which Christ descended, suffered, died, and arose to plant,—the faith sealed by the blood of apostles and martyrs,—the faith once delivered unto the saints, for which it is our duty earnestly to contend. We are baptized, not into the *names* of these Persons, but into the *name* of them. They are described as having but *one name*; and that name, as we shall see, is God.

Now this religion we have taken upon ourselves, and this religion we profess. We have been baptized into this holy name; and as Christians, if we would be consistent—if we would hope to enjoy the mercies of the baptismal covenant,—to that profession we must cling, and in that faith we must work. To reject the doctrine of the Trinity, is to reject the Christian religion. Every thing that is peculiar, all that distinguishes the Gospel from the mere religion of nature,—must be dispensed with, the moment we part with this fundamental doctrine. Yet there are many busy to deprive us of this sure foundation of our faith; “for,” as St. Jude expresses it, “there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation,—ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ;” or, as it is in the original, “denying our only master, God and Lord, Jesus Christ. Let us, therefore, my brethren, try these spirits whether they be of God: let us, with an honest and upright heart, search the Scriptures, whether these things be so; and there can be little doubt to what conclusion we shall come.

First of all, then, let us examine the text by itself. Here the apostles are instructed to baptize into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. One name, then, is mentioned as belonging to the three. Now suppose that name is not God, then we are baptized into the religion of God, a man and a quality. Can there be a greater absurdity? more especially when it is recollected that the Most High God is to be called by the same name as this mortal man, and this nondescript quality. Every rule of common sense and common interpretation shrinks from such absurdities as these: more especially when God has expressly declared that he will not give his name to another,—“I am the Lord, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another.” The

same thing may be said of the concluding verse of the second epistle to the Corinthians, which we use in our daily service. If the three persons mentioned in the text be not God, then our prayer must be rendered, "the grace of a man, and the love of God, and the fellowship of a quality, be with us all evermore." What! the grace of a man before the love of God! Where do we read of the grace of Moses, or the grace of Elijah? much less do we ever hear of the grace of a prophet before the love of God.

The text therefore alone is proof of the Trinity. Interpret it on this principle, and all is clear and self-consistent. Interpret it on any other, and it becomes a mass of profane absurdity. But we are told we cannot understand how there can be three Persons in one God, and therefore we cannot be required to believe it. But if we are not to believe what we cannot understand, we must not believe in God at all; for who can pretend to understand God? nay, by the same rule we cannot believe many things of which our senses assure us; we cannot believe that the grass grows, or that the stars shine; for neither of these things we understand: and least of all can we believe, what appears to be plainest of all, namely, that we live, and move, and have our being; for how all these things take place is altogether beyond our comprehension. So that, if we will not believe what we cannot understand, we must be content to disbelieve that we have existence at all.

It is nothing wonderful that the nature of God should be above our understanding. In our present state it would be impossible to comprehend it; and there are things which even the angels desire to look into. We are not required to *understand*, but to *believe*; not with a blind belief, because evidence abundant has been submitted to us; but still to believe, as we believe many, and indeed most things, without understanding them. "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God;" in what sense he is three, and in what sense he is one, is a secret thing—it is what we shall never comprehend: "but those things which are revealed belong to us and to our children for ever." That the one God *does* exist in three Persons is one of these revealed things. It is a part, therefore, of our spiritual property which we are bound to bequeath unimpaired to our children.

There is no contradiction in the doctrine of the Trinity. The Divine Persons are not three and one in the same sense; though what the senses be in which they are three, and in which they are one, is a point which has been left unrevealed.

We are sometimes told that the word 'Trinity' is not to be found in the Bible. It is astonishing that any person, having the slightest pretension to common sense should put forth such an objection. There is not a doctrine in the Bible which might not be denied in this fashion;—even the existence of God himself. It might be said there is no such word as 'Deity' in the Bible, therefore the Bible doctrine is, that there is no Deity. It is not the *word*, but the *doctrine*, for which we contend. We contend that this doctrine is the doctrine of Scripture: "The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet they are not three Gods, but one God." *That* is the

doctrine of the Trinity: if we believe this doctrine, it matters not what we call it; though there can be no reasonable objection to call it by a word which is both comprehensive and expressive.

So important has the Church conceived this doctrine, that she has set apart a particular festival, on which we thankfully commemorate the mysterious truth; and on this occasion she enjoins her ministers diligently to lay before her faithful children the evidence of their holy faith. In compliance with this her ordinance, I will endeavour, to the best of my humble ability, and with the grace of God, to produce abundant proofs of the truth which we this day most especially profess, observing at the same time, that they are, though sufficient for their purpose, still only a very small part of those, which lie scattered throughout the Bible.

I have noticed the text, and 2 Cor. xiii. 14. as affording positive testimony to the doctrine of the Trinity; I will now produce other texts, equally positive but more detailed. That the Father is God has never been disputed by any who ever took the name of Christian. It will only be necessary to shew the same of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The very title of Son is proof that Christ is God. How did the Jews understand his pretensions to the Messiahship? Did they merely suppose that the Son of God meant a good man? Let us hear their own account. As, in all these cases, so much depends on Scripture proof, I shall name the texts as I quote them. John v. 17. Jesus answered the Jews, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, *making himself equal with God.*" In like manner (John x. 30.) when Christ said, "I and my Father are one," "the Jews took up stones to stone him. Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him saying, For a good work we stone thee not, but for *blasphemy*; and because that thou, being a man, *makest thyself God.*" Now if Christ was a mere man, how shocked would he have been at such a charge! How shocked would Moses have been if he had been accused of making himself equal to God! How would he have eagerly denied the imputation! But no—Christ never denies his pretensions—never attempts to clear himself of the accusation, but quite the contrary. If Christ was only a man, or any thing less than God, and if he made himself equal to God, he was no prophet, no teacher of righteousness, but a profane blasphemer and impostor; then were the Jews in the right, and he was justly condemned. And that Christ *did* make this claim is plain, not only from what has been said, but also from what the apostle observes, Phil. ii. 5. "Let this mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." Here the apostle is recommending humility to his converts by the example of Christ. But surely, if Christ was a mere man, or any thing less than God, it would have been any thing but humility, not to think it robbery to be equal with God. Besides it is allowed that the words "made in the likeness of

men," mean "made a man;" and by the same rule, "being in the form of God," must mean "being God."

In Heb. i. the apostle is employed in shewing the great superiority of Christ even to the highest angels; and amidst much other matter directly belonging to this subject, we find the words of the sixteenth Psalm immediately applied to Christ; thus: "Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, *O God*, is for ever and ever." In Acts xx. 28. St. Paul instructs the Ephesian elders to feed the church of *God*, which he hath purchased with *his own blood*, not with the blood of man, but *his own blood*. In Rom. ix. 5. we read that Christ is "over all, *God* blessed for ever." In Col. ii. 8. we have this warning, to which we shall do well to take diligent heed: "Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy, and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ: for *in him dwelleth ALL THE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD bodily*." Let these vain philosophers inform us how one, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead, can be any other than God. In 1 Tim. iii. 16. occurs the following striking text: "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." All which things are true of Christ, but cannot, in any other sense, be applied to God. In Tit. ii. 13. we read, "the glorious appearing of *the great God* and our Saviour Jesus Christ;" or, as would be much nearer the original, "*our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ*." Surely this is testimony enough to prove that Christ is God.

Let us now see how the Bible discovers to us that the Holy Ghost is God. We have proved that the Son is God; and it is allowed that the Father is so. Now if the Holy Ghost be not God, what must we think of the language of the text? we should be baptized into the religion of two divine persons, and a creature, or a quality. Such an absurdity refutes itself. There is so vast a distance between God and any creature, however exalted in comparison with ourselves, that they can never be associated on a footing of equality. But beside this, we have direct proof that the Holy Ghost is God. In Exod. xxxiv. 33, 34. we read that Moses, when he spoke to the people, put a veil on his face; but when he went in before the Lord, (in the original, Jehovah) to speak with him, he took the veil off. Now in 2 Cor. iii. 19. St. Paul, discoursing on that very passage of the Old Testament, speaks thus: "Now *the Lord* is that *Spirit*; and where the *Spirit of the Lord* is, there is liberty." In Acts v. 3, 4. St. Peter thus addressed Ananias, "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to *the Holy Ghost*?" "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." In 1 Cor. iii. 16. we read—"Know ye not that ye are the temple of *God*, and that the *Spirit of God* dwelleth in you?" A temple clearly means a house of God, and can be no other house. If then Christians are temples of the Holy Ghost, the Holy Ghost is God. And St. Paul here says distinctly, that "we are not only temples, but temples of God, through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost." We are an habitation of *God* through the *Spirit*. The Holy Ghost too has the attribute as well as the name of God. He is called (Heb. ix. 14.) the *eternal Spirit*. In Psalm cxxxix. 7. He is said to be everywhere: "Whither shall I go from



thy Spirit?" In 1 Cor. ii. 10. we read, that "the Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God." And while St. Paul tell us, (2 Timothy iii. 16.) "that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," St. Peter tells us, (2 Peter i. 21.) that "prophecy came not by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The sin against the Holy Ghost is unpardonable. But can we believe that any unpardonable sin could be committed against a creature?"

Thus it appears that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. But though Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are each God; they are "not three Gods but one God." This is equally certain with the other. In Deut. vi. 4. we find, "Hear, O Israel! the Lord our God is one Lord;" and in Mark xii. 29. we find that our Lord made this part of the first of all commandments; so the Apostle tells us, (Gal. iii. 20.) "God is one;" and our Lord himself, (John x. 30.) "I and the Father are one;" and so Isa. xlv. 6. "Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his redeemer, the Lord of Hosts; I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God."

No person, therefore, can read the Scriptures with a simple and sincere mind, without confessing that "the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet they are not three Gods, but one God." And if this be the doctrine of Scripture, it cannot be a light thing, whether we receive it or not. If we do not worship the God of the Bible, it is immaterial what we worship. The God of the Bible is the one God—the only God; and the very first on the table of His commandments is, "Thou shalt have none other gods." If we set up a God of our own, we worship we know not what; we pay our vows, like the idolatrous Athenians, to an unknown god. "The Catholic faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the substance." It is the faith preached in Scripture; and without it we are no Christians, and in no covenant of salvation; we renounce the terms of our baptism, and by consequence all its privileges. The language of Scripture on this subject is very strong. "Many deceivers," says St. John, "are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist." "There shall be false teachers," says St. Peter, "among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction;" "whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not."

God said when he brought the first-begotten into the world, "Let all the angels of God worship Him." And shall we withhold from Him that worship which all the angels of God are proud to render? "We now see through a glass, darkly;" but let us take heed that we use the light which is afforded us, and which, if followed, will assuredly conduct us to Him who sent it. "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him."

Without the grace of the Holy Spirit to renew our sinful hearts, we should not even be able to pray as we ought. The Spirit helpeth our



infirmities, and maketh intercession for us. Suppose we discredit His divinity. What follows? If the Spirit be God, as the Scripture teacheth us, what is this but something very near to speaking against the Holy Ghost? that dreadful sin, which shall never be forgiven? Is it not, at least, grieving the Holy Spirit of God, and tempting Him to forsake a temple where he is renounced and denied?

The doctrine of the Trinity, then, is not merely an opinion which a Christian may hold or reject at pleasure. It is the foundation of all doctrine and practice. Without it we cannot consistently believe either redemption or sanctification. If Christ be only a man, he cannot redeem us; for "none can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him." And since we cannot redeem ourselves, our sins have forfeited us to the wrath of God. If the Holy Ghost be only a quality, he cannot sanctify us; for a quality can have no powers or operations. "But ye, beloved, building yourselves up in your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life."

"Now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and for ever! Amen."

H. T.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

### ON THE EARLY FATHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

#### No. XXII.

#### CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

Κλήμης ὁ θαυμασιός.—Euseb. Præp. Evang. II. 2. iv. 16.

THE enlargement of the human faculties, and the acquisition of secular knowledge, in due subservience to religion, is not only unopposed to the spirit of Christianity, but tends, in no insignificant degree, to the furtherance of Gospel Truth. True indeed it is, that the pride of learning, and a supercilious conceit of exalted attainments, is inconsistent with the humility which "thinks soberly" of its own pretensions: but the possession of great intellectual acquirements does not necessarily impel men to "think more highly of themselves than they ought to think." A striking example of this position is afforded in the subject of the present article. He was, perhaps, the most learned of all the Patristical writers; but his multifarious erudition was wholly free from every appearance of dogmatic self-sufficiency. Jerome, Cyril, Theodoret, and others, bear their united testimony to his extensive learning and research; and his own disclaimer against arrogance will be readily admitted by those who are acquainted with his works. In the first book of his *Stromata*, (I. I. p. 322.) he declares, that they were not composed *εἰς ἐπίδειξιν*, for ostentation, but as an artless picture of the discourses of his several instructors."

TITUS FLAVIUS CLEMENS, to whom the surname of ALEXANDRINUS is commonly attached, is supposed by some to have been so called from the place of his birth, and by others from the seat of his education. According to the latter opinion, he was a native of Athens;\* and it is not improbable, from his own statement respecting the course of his studies, that such was the fact. His first preceptor was an Ionian, by some conjectured to have been Dionysius of Corinth, under whose tuition he placed himself in Greece. Thence he travelled into Italy, and afterwards into the East; where the teacher whose lectures he attended, was an Assyrian, whom conjecture has identified either with Tatian, or Bardesanes. Removing into Egypt, a Hebrew, of long descent, whom he describes as the most able and accomplished of his several preceptors, was also the last to whom he applied for instruction. This highly-gifted individual was Pantænus. Originally an heathen (Euseb. P. E. II. 2.), he directed perhaps his first inquiries into the various systems of Gentile philosophy; culling what was good from all, and adhering at last to the Eclectic sect, who, at that time, were numerous in Alexandria. "I espoused," says he, "the dogmas of no particular sect; but selecting from the Stoics, the Platonics, the Epicureans, and the Aristotelians, whatever was just and fitting, and built upon religious principles, that I called Philosophy."† To which of his preceptors he was more immediately indebted for his conversion to Christianity is unknown; but he speaks of having imbibed the rudiments of the faith from those who had received them directly from the Apostles (*Strom. ubi supra*). Pantænus perfected and strengthened the foundation which had been thus happily laid.

During the absence of his distinguished preceptor in India, Clement, as already stated, supplied his place in the direction of the Catechetical school of Alexandria; nor did the celebrity of the institution decline under his management. Some of the most distinguished ornaments of the Christian church, received from him the first principles of their profession; and, among others, Origen completed his education in the interval of his vicegerency. Alexander, afterwards bishop of Jerusalem, was also one of his scholars, as he himself testifies in a letter to Origen (ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. 14.); between whom and his preceptor the most cordial affection was engendered, which, strengthened and cemented by mutual suffering, nothing but death could interrupt. Nor were the labours of Clement confined to his catechetical duties. Early in the reign of Severus, A.D. 194, he was ordained presbyter of the church of Alexandria (Euseb. Chron.); thus dividing his occupation between the education of the young, and the pastoral superintendence of his flock. He was also now engaged in the publication of the *Stromata*; and the date of his other writings will not, in all probability, vary much from the same period. There are no positive marks, indeed, by which the time, at which they were respectively published, can be

\* Eriphan. Hæc. XXXII. 6. Κλήμης τε, ὃν φασὶ τινες Ἀλεξανδρέα, ἕτεροι δὲ Ἀθηναῖον. He was also called *Stromateus* from his principal work.

† *Strom.* I. 7. p. 338. Φιλοσοφίαν δὲ, οὐ τὴν Στωϊκὴν λέγω, οὐδὲ τὴν Πλατωνικὴν, ἢ τὴν Ἐπικούρειαν τε, καὶ Ἀριστοτελικήν· ἀλλ' ὅσα εἴρηται παρ' ἑκάστη τῶν αἰρέσεων τούτων καλῶς, δικαιοσύνην μετὰ εὐσεβοῦς ἐπιστήμης ἐκδιδάσκοντα, τοῦτο σὺμπάν τὸ ἐκλεκτικὸν Φιλοσοφίαν φημί.

immediately ascertained; but a chronological statement of ecclesiastical matters, which he has inserted in the *Stromata* (I. 21. p. 402. s. 99), closes with the death of *Commodus*. It may therefore be fairly inferred with Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* VI. 6.), that the computation was made in the commencement of the succeeding reign; and there does not seem to have been any considerable interval between his various productions.

The ninth year of Severus is unhappily memorable for the renewal of persecutions against the primitive church; and the Christians of Alexandria did not escape their share of suffering. Earnest and unwavering in the discharge of his ministerial functions, Clement would naturally be exposed to more than ordinary danger from the popular excitement. In one of the sections of the *Stromata* (IV. 10. p. 597.) he inculcates the lawfulness of flight in seasons of persecution, in accordance with our Saviour's admonition in *Matt.* x. 23. *When they persecute you in one city, flee ye into another*; and accordingly he avoided the perils which surrounded him, and preserved his life for future exertions in the cause of the Gospel, by removing from Alexandria. His first place of sojourn was *Jerusalem*; where the zeal of his friend and pupil, in promoting the interests of Christianity among the Jews, had so irritated the rulers, that he had been cast into prison. The loss of their bishop's services was, in some measure, compensated to the church of Jerusalem by the labours of Clement, who preached constantly during his residence among them with considerable effect. In a letter, of which he was the bearer to Antioch, Alexander recommends him to the care and confidence of the brethren in that primitive community; and speaks of his pastoral ministrations as having greatly "established and increased the church of Christ." (*Ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl.* VI. 11.)

From Jerusalem then, in the year 205, Clement proceeded to Antioch, with the intention, no doubt, of furthering, as far as in him lay, the propagation of the Gospel. Though no record is left of the success which attended his exhortations, they were not, it may be hoped and believed, altogether in vain. After the death of Pantænus, in the beginning of the reign of Caracalla, he was again at the head of the Alexandrian seminary (*Euseb. Hist. Eccl.* VI. 6. *Jerome de Vir. Ill.* § 38.), in which he had formerly acted as *locum tenens*; and in this situation he probably remained till his death. The time when he was removed from his career of earthly usefulness, is altogether unknown; nor is there the remotest vestige of his magisterial or pastoral history subsequent to his departure from Antioch. In *Usuard's Martyrology*, the 4th of December is said to have been dedicated to his memory.

Of the writings of Clement, Jerome has remarked (*ubi supra*) that they are all "full of erudition and eloquence, borrowed from the treasures of Holy Writ and secular learning;" and by the few, which still remain to us, the testimony is amply verified. He may, in some respects, be thought, perhaps, to have placed profane literature too much upon a level with sacred truth; but the nature of the controversy, in which he was engaged, would scarcely admit of any alternative. It was not likely that arguments drawn from the Christian

Scriptures would carry much force with them in a dispute with heathen sages, respecting the absurdities of their philosophical notions of God and of religion. Clement has been accused, also, of holding heretical opinions; but on this point it will be necessary to speak in the sequel. The work *περὶ Ὑποτυπώσεων*, in which† they are said to have been advanced is no longer extant; and there is every reason to believe that it had been shamefully interpolated. His three principal writings still remain, and they are altogether subversive of the charge which has been brought against him: viz. 1. *Προτρεπτικὸς λόγος*, or an Exhortation to the Gentiles. 2. *The Pædagogic*, in three books; and 3. Eight books of Miscellanies, entitled *Stromata*. There is also a dissertation, generally supposed to be genuine, on the question, *Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος*; The “*Epitome of Oriental Doctrine*, from Theodotus;” the “*Excerpta from the Prophets*;” and the “*Adumbrations on the Canonical Epistles*;” are generally supposed to be fragments of the *Hypotyposes*, as corrupted by the Gnostics and Valentinians.

Had Clement completed all his projects, he would have been an exceedingly voluminous writer. Frequent promises of future volumes occur in his works, which are still extant; and it is not improbable that some of them were written, though they have not survived the wreck of time.\* Of treatises known to have been in existence in antient times, the following list, compiled from Eusebius, Jerome, and others, is complete: 1. *Canon Ecclesiasticus*; addressed to the Jews, and dedicated to Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem. 2. An essay on the prophet *Amos*. 3. On *Providence*. 4. On the time of keeping *Easter*. 5. On *Fasting*. 6. On *Slander*. 7. An *Exhortation to the newly baptized*. Little, however, is known respecting these works, beyond their titles; and we shall, therefore, in our next number, proceed to the analysis of the surviving remains of this important Father.

#### CURÆ EXEGETICÆ.

SEVERAL Correspondents have referred to us difficult texts of Scripture, requesting solutions, and that we would occasionally devote a portion of our miscellany to the discussion of obscure scriptural and liturgical passages. In answer to the queries of “a Scottish Episcopal Presbyter,” we offer the following:—

Gal. iii. 20.—Ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἐνδὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἔτε ἔστιν.

“Now a mediator is not [the agent] of one; but God is one.”

This is confessedly one of the most abstruse passages in the whole Bible; we would not therefore speak on it dogmatically. After an attentive consideration of it, and perusal of commentators, the most probable interpretation appears to us to be the following. The drift of the apostle’s argument is the impotence of the law for justification. This law was delivered through the hand of a Mediator. “Now a

\* Thus he promises a work on the *Resurrection*, in *Pæd.* ii. 10. p. 232. On *Mariage*, *Pæd.* iii. 8. p. 278. On *Angels*, *Strom.* vi. 3. p. 755. And on the *Creation*, *Strom.* vi. 18. p. 698. Similar references might readily be multiplied.

*Mediator*," as the very term implies, is not simply the agent "*of one*" party; he acts on behalf of more, and always of parties at variance. "*But God is one*;" the Mediator cannot therefore be an agent for God only, but must be that of some other party also. In this case the Israelites are that party; they must therefore be at variance with God; and thus the very circumstances under which the law was given prove that it did not justify, but left the variance abiding.

Mark xi. 12, 13.—Our correspondent finds it difficult to reconcile this text with the omniscience of our Lord. We do not share his perplexity: Jesus was about to give his disciples an instructive lesson in his *human* capacity.

Prov. xxxi. 21.—The word translated *scarlet* should be rendered *double garments*, as the margin gives it. The root is שָׁכָה, *iteravit*; and it is therefore sometimes used for the *Tyrian dye*; as Horace, (Lib. II. Od. xvii.)

"Te bis Afro

Murice tincla

Vestirent lanæ.

Matt. xviii. 10.—The allusion is to the doctrine of guardian spirits, which is fully borne out by Scripture. Thus, when St. Peter was miraculously liberated, the disciples said, "It is his angel" [that has done this], which was the fact. (Acts xii. 15.) See Heb. i. 14; Ps. xxxiv. 7.

Luke ix. 18.—(which is the text our correspondent means by Luke ix. 10.) is not distinctly translated. The word rendered *alone* is κατὰ μόνας, which is an elliptical expression for κατὰ μόνας χώρας, *in retired places*. There is no contradiction therefore in the clause, "his disciples were with him."

The expression, "with my body I thee worship" in the Matrimonial Service, is fully explained in the Notes to Bishop Mant's Common Prayer. The term *worship*, in old English, does not signify the respect due to God only. In the old Translation of 1 Sam. ii. 30. the words stood "Him that worshippeth me I will worship;" i.e. *I will make honourable*. The husband promises to confer upon his wife all his *personal* honours, titles, &c.—making her his equal in rank, and participator in his station; denoting, in short, the difference between the privileges of a wife, and the casual favours received by a concubine.

The expression in the Burial Service, "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life," &c. has been very needlessly impugned. We commit the body to the ground, not in the certainty of its resurrection to eternal life, but in the *hope* of that event; this hope we call a sure and certain hope, because it is exercised on certainties. The ancient heathens had a hope of eternal life, but the very existence of such a life was to them an uncertainty. Their hope might be therefore called an *uncertain hope*, and is actually called by Virgil, "*Spes incerta futuri*." But "life and immortality are brought to light by the Gospel;" to us they are certainties; the hope of them may therefore be justly called a sure and certain hope, because it is directed to certainties. After all, the expression does not *directly* refer to the resurrection of the particular person, but to the general doctrine of the resurrection.

## CHRISTIAN SABBATHS.

## HYMNS FOR THE FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

## MORNING.—ISAIAH, CH. I.

ALMIGHTY God! the pure and just!  
 How shall we dare approach thy throne,  
 When, lowly prostrate in the dust,  
 With trembling lips our guilt we own?

Thy sons in name, to Thee baptized,  
 And blest with Thy paternal care,  
 How have we all Thy love despised,  
 Or mocked Thee with the heartless prayer!

But Thou hast bid us turn and live,  
 Sparing our guilt with long delay;  
 And wilt Thou with the sinner strive,  
 Yet spurn the penitent away?

O Lamb of God, for sinners slain,  
 Renew our hearts, our sins forgive!  
 So, cleans'd from every crimson stain,  
 Our spotless souls to Thee shall live.

## EVENING.—ISAIAH, CH. II.

His kingdom comes! Ye saints, rejoice!  
 Let earth and heaven unite their voice  
 To swell the lofty strain.  
 Shout, shout the awful news abroad;  
 The mighty King! The glorious God!  
 He comes, on earth to reign!

High o'er the wrecks of worldly state,  
 On chosen Sion's topmost seat,  
 Jehovah sets His throne.  
 Now shall the lands confess His power,  
 And all the earth His name adore,  
 And serve the Lord alone.

Before the terrors of His face,  
 The pride of mortal man shall cease,  
 And every idol fall.  
 Prostrate be every lofty foe;  
 The pomp and power of earth lie low;  
 And God be all in all!

## SELF-BAPTISM.

MR. EDITOR,—In conversation the other day with a party of friends, which ran a good deal upon the subject contained in the following paper, one of the company recollected, he said, a curious case in point, *viz.* that of a person, who actually baptized *himself*. I thought the case so remarkable as to be worth the attempt to become acquainted with particulars; and learning from him that it occurred at Rickmansworth, I applied, through a common friend, to the Rector, requesting him to inform me of what he might know respecting so unusual an occurrence. Mr. H. very kindly gratified my curiosity, and sent me the following account: with permission (upon my requesting it) to offer it to the CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

Your obedient Servant,

T. S.

“REV. SIR,—In reply to your enquiry through our excellent friend, the Archdeacon of St. Alban’s, I hasten to state what cannot easily be forgotten. On my first coming to this parish, I found Christopher Leach, drawing near to his eightieth year, in the occupation of a small farm, illiterate, but respected by all around him for his uniform habits of industry and sobriety, and his general good conduct. He lived a mile from the church, a trying hill for aged limbs lying between the house of God and his own: but he was still seen not unfrequently at the former, though never at the *Lord’s table*. On this subject I took repeated opportunities of conversing with him, but for years in vain. He seemed indisposed to comply with my wishes, though ready to allow that it was his duty to do so. On the day that he completed his ninetieth year, I took my walk that way, being aware of the circumstance; and after a few natural remarks on the goodness of God, in prolonging his life with the use of his faculties beyond the ordinary period, I drew him by degrees to the subject of many former conversations: and then it was that he said he would let me into a secret which he could never bring himself to disclose before, though it had all along been the principal cause of his hesitation with regard to the Lord’s supper. “I was never christened, Sir; owing to a disagreement on the subject of baptism between my father and mother, one of whom was a member of the Church of England, the other, an anabaptist. Growing up to man’s estate, and hearing the matter often talked of, I began to feel uneasy; and in that state of mind I got up very early one summer’s morning and walked down to Common Moor, (through which flows the river Colne) when I took off my clothes, and walked into the water, baptizing myself in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Returning home, I told no one at the time what I had done, hoping all was right. But in later life I have often had my doubts, and particularly since I was urged to come to the other sacrament.”

From the honest character of old Leach, I have no doubt that he told me, on this occasion, the exact truth, singular as the story may appear. I thanked him for his confidence in me, and earnestly entreated him to comply without delay with the Form of Baptism established in our Church; and I had, in fact, the pleasure of baptizing him the following week, in the presence of his two sons, men between fifty and sixty years of age, the elder of them still living in an



adjoining parish, on a considerable farm belonging to Lord Clarendon, to whom he is bailiff. In a week or so after the ceremony of baptism, he received from the same hand, and in company with his eldest son and a third person, the other sacrament also; and he continued to receive it, from time to time, till his death.

A grave-stone in Rickmansworth church-yard records that event thus :—

“ To the memory of  
CHRISTOPHER LEACH,  
Who died, October 11, 1822.  
Aged 94.

Beloved by all who knew him.”

“ Rickmansworth, May, 1832.”

“ E. H.”

Upon the above subject, I beg to offer the following remarks :—

In the year 1810 a pamphlet was published, with the title, “ Remarks upon a Report of Judgment, delivered by the Right Hon. Sir John Nicholl, Knight, LL. D. &c.” in the case of the Rev. W. W. Wickes. In this pamphlet, the author argues forcibly against the validity of any unauthorized baptism, and falls into the following passage :—

“ In her offices of baptism, the Church commits this sacrament into the hand of her ministers *alone*; and makes no exception in favour of others; and in the exhortation used in the office for the baptism of adults, she most decidedly rejects the *absolute* necessity of this sacrament, and speaks of the ‘great necessity of it *where it may be had.*’ Now, this is a plain indication of her opinion, that baptism cannot always be had. But lay baptism may always be had, if the notion be true that *any* man can baptize. In this short passage, therefore, I cannot but perceive a strong opposition to the validity of lay baptism, an effectual condemnation of that sort of baptism which may always be had, and a full comment upon the word *generally*, as used in her catechism. Lay baptism, I repeat it, may always be had at any time, and in any place whatever. It would be sufficient for my present argument, were I to limit the assertion to this restriction, *viz.* whenever *two* persons may meet; but I go much further, and challenge any one who rejects the necessity of the sacerdotal authority and commission, and allows the competency of any lay person to baptize, to shew cause why he ought not to admit of *self-baptism*. He admits that I, a layman, may baptize my footman, or my nurse, and that they may baptize me. Why am not I equally capable of performing the ceremony on myself? If I can do it for another, why may I not do it for myself?”\*  
T. S.

#### COLLECTANEA.

HARROW SCHOOL.—The governor's scholarships this year have been awarded to Mr. John Godley, son of J. Godley, Esq. of Killegar, Leitrim, Ireland; and to Mr. W. S. Richardson, son of Sir J. Richardson, of Bedford-square.

The *Missal* painted for the Archduke Ferdinand, by George Hufuagal, which is considered one of the most beautiful and exquisite specimens of the art of illumination, occupied the artist's undivided attention full eight years.

\* A letter upon the above subject may be seen in Vol. III. 407, of our Miscellany.

THE SYSTEM AND PRACTICE OF CONGREGATIONAL DISSENT  
UNFAVOURABLE TO RELIGION.

To separate from a Church founded upon the Scriptures, organized by the Fathers of the Reformation, and uniting the great majority of the wise and good, admits rather of being excused than justified. What plea, then, shall charity offer for those who league themselves against her with their common enemies,—with the Papist who envies her possessions, and with the demagogue and infidel who hate her purity?

Could Dissent sustain the accusations that the discipline of the Church is corrupt, her clergy generally irreligious, her followers careless, and her services formal, it would indeed become a high and solemn duty to denounce her; but the candid inquirer will easily discover that Dissent offers its own practice as the standard; and, in the exercise of assumed infallibility, condemns all that differs from itself.

Against the sentence awarded by such a tribunal, and founded upon such principles, the Church may well appeal. She may even retort upon Dissent its own charges; and sustain them, not by general inferences drawn from alleged individual misconduct, but by tracing the effects, which, upon established moral principles, may be expected to result from proved, or undisputed conditions. This, in such a question, is the only satisfactory line of argument. The pretended examples may in fact be exceptions; but, in reasoning upon extended subjects, we shall not err in receiving as a general conclusion, the natural and ordinary result of causes which apply to the whole.

The unprosperous state of any religious body, not crushed by external circumstances, proves the existence of some inherent, essential fault: for success will constantly attend an institution at once judicious in itself, and efficiently administered; and the Divine blessing may be expected for that Christian community, whose discipline is most accordant to the will of God, and whose members act most consistently with the Christian spirit. To what, then, must be ascribed the progressive decline of Dissent?

That a very serious decline really exists, is proved by facts too clear to be mistaken. Persons employed to collect in aid of embarrassed chapels are now far less successful than formerly. A more unequivocal proof is afforded by the amount of the funds collected annually for missionary purposes. In the societies connected with the Church, these funds have increased enormously. Methodism, the poorest of all sects, has displayed a steady annual advance. But the Baptist mission has made no progress; and that of the Independents has declined one-fifth. Yet a missionary spirit has become more ardent and universal; the efforts on behalf of these societies have been renewed, and increased year by year; and every engine which party emulation and religious zeal can supply, is unceasingly exerted for them. Only declining strength can explain why redoubled exertions fail to produce corresponding results.

It is admitted by dissenting writers, that the most respectable and best informed of their young persons desert their cause for the

Church; but this, however it may weaken the political importance of Dissent, would not so materially diminish its numbers. Methodism has been its grand adversary; gathering in multitudes of those who otherwise would have been dissenters, and receiving a large portion of its seceders. The discipline of Methodism, moulded closely after that of the Church, secures it from ruinous quarrels: its excitement is agreeable to the lower classes, and its preachers far surpass dissenting ministers in active and every-day zeal. The contest between the two parties is therefore in all points unequal; and wherever they are fairly brought into the field, Dissent gradually yields to the advance of its rival: Methodism now considerably outnumbered Dissent.

Wales, indeed, offers a great exception to this remark; but the case is peculiar. The Welsh language is still generally spoken by the lower classes, and the Methodists have very few Welsh preachers. Besides, Methodism itself is tame, when compared with Welsh dissent; and the doctrines of Calvinism are maintained almost universally among the lower classes in Wales, who are thus naturally prejudiced against a sect whose leading tenets they condemn as a heresy.

The Society which has recently organized itself as the champion of a cause whose unsatisfactory condition it thus virtually admits, has mistaken at once the nature of the evil, and the mode of counteracting it. A Christian body, which can flourish only as its principles and conduct accord with the Gospel, will receive no advantage from having the worst feelings of our nature arrayed in its behalf. The intemperate speeches and violent publications which delight the bigot, will disgust the moderate partisan, and repel the candid inquirer.

In truth, Dissent is a human institution, whose leading feature is republicanism, as its model was Geneva; and which, containing within itself the principles of mortality, even now displays the querulous infirmity of age. Its mortal evils are identified with itself; and the very points which it displays most proudly in ostentatious contrast to the corresponding features of the Establishment, are those most fatal to its prosperity.

The government of a dissenting chapel is a pure democracy, in which all questions are decided by vote, and every one has an equal voice. Its officers, subjected in all things to the will of the multitude, sustain the responsibility of office, but are allowed none of its authority; while the individuals to whose dictation they must submit, are chiefly of the lower and uneducated classes, the great majority being females. Persons who are required to obey in every other situation will be especially jealous of the petty authority they possess in chapel conclave: and, as they visit almost exclusively with persons of their own sect, every facility is afforded by their tea-table coteries to form cabals which may destroy the peace of a chapel, or harass a minister into resignation.

Since there is no controlling power (for no one is allowed the authority, which at their meetings would enable him to act as moderator), the most trifling dispute may become a party question. A secession, therefore, commonly follows a serious dispute; and, where the question involves the appointment or dismissal of a minister, a numerous minority will sometimes endeavour to establish a rival chapel.

The friendly interference of other chapels would be contrary to the principles of Dissent. Every congregation is entirely independent even of the body to which it belongs; the whole sect, like each individual chapel, being composed of disunited members, without a head. When, therefore, a chapel falls into difficulties, it continues to decline, until the prospect of utter ruin unites the contending parties, or the appointment of a popular minister restores a temporary prosperity.

The advocate of republican principles in church government, naturally extends them to civil institutions; and thus every consistent dissenter becomes a democrat in politics. A reference to the standard works of Dissent, as well periodical as others, and to the recorded opinions of its leading characters, will fully substantiate this charge. Indeed, we too often see its ministers commit, unproved, the indecency of taking a leading part in public political meetings. No monarchical government could long subsist in a country where the principles of Dissent possessed a decided supremacy. Happily, its politics estrange from it the most intelligent of its adherents; for the advocate of a conscientious obedience to constituted authorities, though he may continue nominally a Dissenter, will have relinquished the fundamental principles of Dissent.

Whatever authorities may be cited, or texts wrested, in support of congregational discipline, it requires no argument to prove that a system, whose natural tendency is to insubordination and contention, cannot be of Divine appointment. Nor is liberty of conscience a principle of Dissent, however dissenters may be startled at the assertion. It was emphatically disclaimed, when a successful rebellion had given them a temporary supremacy; and if Dissent were again invested with power, there is little reason to hope from its principles, or conduct, for greater liberality. Democracy is always intolerant when invested with power; and the liberty it offers, like the *conge d'elire* to a Dean and Chapter, is only permission to make the choice it prescribes. Even now, the seceder from a dissenting congregation receives very little charity; and in the only place where Dissent enjoys political influence,—the South Sea Islands,—we see its ministers exercising a despotic control over their followers; while they sanction, according to the testimony of their own historian, the punishment of idolatry by the law, and its suppression by the sword.

Dissenters are not less inconsistent with their own practice, when they condemn the endowments of the Church. Many of their own chapels are endowed; and the principle which they admit for a part, they cannot condemn for the whole. They retained for themselves the endowments of the Establishment during the Rebellion; and it is one of their heaviest complaints that they were deprived of them after the Restoration. Party objections will seldom bear examination. The professed principle of Dissent,—that the emoluments of a minister should be derived from the voluntary contributions of his followers,—would provide religious instruction only for towns; and it presumes that the multitude are already so far enlightened, as to appreciate its value, and to tax themselves for its support. Upon this principle, more than half the population of the country would be consigned to heathen barbarism.

Nor do we find in the conduct of dissenting ministers the apostolic disinterestedness which they demand from the Clergy. Their poor chapels are either declined, or accepted from necessity, but as stepping-stones to better; and when a rich congregation wish for a minister ever so usefully settled, no considerations of delicacy prevent them from giving him "a call." In the report of an "Association," or meeting of deputies from all the congregations of a district, given in one of their magazines about two years since, it was stated that nearly half the chapels in the district were destitute of settled ministers! Is this a system upon which the country may safely depend for its religious instruction?

It is the boast of Dissenters, that while the Church exacts from her followers every qualification but religion, *they* require unexceptionable piety as the first great essential. Their practice is to select those young men who have given satisfactory proof, as well of their piety, as of a competent talent for preaching; and to qualify them to become the stated heads of congregations by a course of study varying from one to four years, either in one of their academies, or under the roof of a superior minister. It requires but a little knowledge of the influence of circumstances upon character, to discover such serious defects in this plan, as to forbid all surprise that the result should be unsatisfactory. Most of the students are exposed to a formidable ordeal at the commencement of their career, in being taken from the lower walks of life, and placed at once in the station of gentlemen; and of the few who relinquish advantageous prospects for the pulpit, it is not uncharitable to ask if the motive be most frequently supplied by the imprudence of vanity, or the zeal of religion. A complete change of situation,—a hazardous experiment in every case,—is peculiarly fatal to young men; for religious feelings, not grounded upon religious principles, nor confirmed by religious habits, quickly vanish, or subside to a formal profession, when the attention is strongly directed to a new object. The nature of their studies affords no protection: they are taken from the practice of religion to study its theory; and in the science of divinity, as such, there is no more religion than in natural philosophy.

The late Mr. Fuller, Secretary to the Baptist Mission, wrote on this subject to Dr. Newman, afterwards Principal of the Baptist Academy at Stepney, who has given his sanction to Mr. F.'s sentiments by publishing the letter. The following are extracts:—

"I am glad that the Committee have unanimously invited you to the tutorship at Stepney, and that you have been led to accede to their invitation . . . I know something of Bristol, and Olney, and Bradford; . . . but though I am acquainted with these places, yet I know but little of their interior concerns, unless it be what is common to all institutions of this kind, that young men who come to them are seldom overloaded with self-knowledge. I know brother S. of O. has sometimes put "Mason on Self-Knowledge" into a young man's hand to read, and which has operated so powerfully, that the party has been upon the point of leaving him, and returning to his former occupation.

"You will find some of doubtful religion; others, inveterately dull; others, destitute of ministerial gifts as a ground to work upon. In

either case, the party should be dismissed, though in as tender a way as possible. . . .\*

"The Evangelical Clergy go to college irreligious; they acquire their learning in that state. Being called of God before they leave college, or soon after it, religion sanctifies their learning, and makes the last impression. On the other hand, a youth with us goes to an Academy, as we suppose, religious, and, it may be, really so; but having had nothing like a previous education, he has every thing to learn. Learning is a new world to him, and is in danger of greatly effacing his religion, and of leaving an impression of self-conceit on his future character. It were much better, if we might allude to a compost of lime and earth for manure, that there should be first a layer of learning, and then of religion to sanctify it, than of religion, and then of learning to model it. The last impression too is of consequence through life."

The attainments which these young men acquire at the academy are, with few exceptions, below mediocrity. Two, three, or even four years, can effect but little for a person, who, at the age of manhood, goes to school, with a mind undisciplined by former habits of study; ignorant of the lowest rudiments of the classics, and for the most part even of the principles of his own language; whose attention is directed less to literary superiority, than to pulpit excellence; and who loses the most valuable portion of his time from being generally much engaged towards the close of his residence in preaching in the neighbouring villages, or in supplying destitute congregations.†

Following the Dissenting minister from the Academy to the pulpit, we find him exposed to all the snares of his calling, yet deprived of its most important advantages. This will appear evident, when we consider the dangers to be apprehended, and the benefits to be obtained, from ministerial and pastoral duties. The first, highly important as they are to the congregation, require the most jealous vigilance on the part of the minister, lest they become a snare to his own soul. Very few, it is to be feared, escape altogether from that professional feeling, whose tendency is to make them lecturers, instead of apostles, in the pulpit; and critics, instead of disciples, in the pew. A still more serious danger arises from the talent necessarily displayed in the public services of religion; which, commanding admiration, will too often be exerted for no higher motive. The minister who allows his views to rest upon any object short of the great end of his calling, will be likely to experience an awful decline in his own spirituality.

The Dissenter is peculiarly exposed to these dangers. An almost exclusive importance is attached to his public duties, and nearly the whole service is his own composition. He depends, moreover, so entirely upon his pulpit abilities for his credit, and, consequently, for his very subsistence, that no ordinary motives will prevent him from cultivating, in some degree, the arts of display.

---

\* Yet in every such instance, the young man had given proofs of talent and piety, quite satisfactory to the "Church" which sent him to the Academy.

† The writer of the above was educated by a dissenting minister, whose character as a scholar stood so high that he was occasionally intrusted with the education of students for the ministry. He generally required a lexicon or dictionary, when the upper classes translated their lessons; and in arithmetic he employed a key.



But the faithful discharge of pastoral duties, affords great and unqualified advantage. Fastidiousness may shrink from witnessing the sufferings of the poor, and thoughtlessness may overlook them; but when these sufferings are forced upon the attention, few can withhold their sympathy. "He that giveth to the poor, lendeth to the Lord," who repays the debt with unalloyed blessings; for the consciousness of duties performed, and the spectacle of the happiness we have conferred, produce an elevated serenity, which, though not strictly a religious feeling, is yet closely allied to it, and eminently calculated to produce it: while the cost of real charity is too small to allow vanity to rest a boast upon it; and the pleasure it affords, too pure to admit the intrusion of self-complacency.

Dissenting ministers would be disposed equally with the clergy to perform these duties, but their situation does not call for them;—unlike the clergyman, who is interested in the welfare of all his parish, and whose office, while it places him above the hostility, or caprice of the highest parishioner, makes him the friend of the lowest. Their sphere is very circumscribed; they are expected to visit occasionally the members of their "church," *i. e.* those in whom alone authority is vested; and prudence dictates a proper attention to the respectable part of their congregations. But the purest motives would be tainted by the policy which exacts these official visits; and the influence of a minister is too seriously weakened by a sense of dependence on his part, and of power on that of his people, ever to allow him the feelings and character of the independent and disinterested benefactor. Thus, instead of watching and ruling his flock, he is conciliating his masters: instead of unmasking self-delusion, and enforcing the practice of religion with the faithfulness of an apostle, he is prudently securing his professional connexion. His pastoral visits become morning calls. SUCH IS THE NATURAL CURSE OF A DEPENDENT MINISTRY.

A reputation for piety is far more certainly obtained by ostentatious profession, than by the quiet and regular performance of Christian duties. "God looketh at the heart," but man, judging only from outward appearances, is often deceived in his estimate of individual character. Yet, in reasoning upon classes, general premises will authorize general conclusions; and when circumstances unfavourable to religion are found to be identified with the system of Dissent, it is to be expected that, however individuals may escape their influence, they will operate injuriously on the general body.

The first of these is the practice so universal among dissenters of associating almost exclusively with persons of their own persuasion; a practice which, enabling them to estimate themselves by a flattered portrait, while they display their rivals in exaggerated caricature, has an almost inevitable tendency to substitute the prejudices and self-sufficiency of a sect, for the catholic and humble spirit of religion. Indeed, Christian liberality is a plant to which the soil of Dissent is eminently unfavourable. In all, except the few endowed chapels, the emoluments of the minister, and the credit of the cause, depend upon the number and respectability of the congregation. Hence, though accessions may be the most welcome, when gathered in from the world or from the Established Church, they are not unacceptable,



when obtained at the expense of another dissenting cause. It were folly to expect charity, where all the elements of professional rivalry are thus in constant and full operation.

A far more serious evil is, the very low importance dissenters attach to principle. It is a maxim with them that every one should attend the ministry of that preacher under whom he experiences the greatest benefit; in other words, that taste, not conscience, should dictate the choice; for they act upon this opinion so far, that it is common for them to tolerate doctrines which they condemn, for the sake of a preacher whom they admire.\* The practice is most injurious, even to the political prosperity of Dissent, for it makes the success of a chapel dependent upon the popularity of the minister. The favourite who attracts a very large congregation, obtains it, in a great measure, at the expense of other chapels; which are thus enfeebled, not only by desertion, but also by the dissatisfaction felt towards their less talented pastor by the individuals who remain. A chapel which has once seriously declined, seldom regains its former prosperity; indeed, its poverty would prevent it from commanding a sufficiently talented minister. Nor is the prosperity of its rival without danger; for a popular preacher makes a fastidious congregation: and whenever he may be removed, the most fatal dissensions usually arise at the appointment of his successor.

The system is not less injurious personally. It converts congregations into an audience, who, unconsciously perhaps, seek gratification rather than instruction. There are chapels indeed, which, like theatres, are built and supported for the profit of shareholders; who secure full houses by providing a succession of popular pulpit-actors. It were mockery to apply the name of religion to such services; yet the principle, whose destructive character is so apparent, when thus carried to its full extent, is vindicated and acted upon by all dissenters.

Nor is this indifference to principle confined to the minor points of doctrine which form the distinction between orthodox sects. It extends even to the fundamental truths of Christianity. The ministers of the three denominations in and around London, admit the Socinians to their fellowship. Their place of meeting, where their common library is kept, and the births of their children are registered, is managed by a board of Socinians. The committee for the protection of their religious privileges have a Socinian for their chairman. Hostility to the Church appears to be with them an all-sufficient passport. Even the notorious O'Connell was admitted upon this ground to take a prominent part, the caressed and applauded orator, at one of their

---

\* The following case is of very recent occurrence. A member in a small chapel, dissatisfied with his minister, and disappointed in his attempts to remove him, became himself a rival preacher, and drew off as many of the congregation as he could influence. The seceders, finding that their numbers continued small, at length broke up their establishment; but instead of returning to the fold they had deserted, they joined the methodists. Thus turning their back upon their principles as Calvinists, Baptists, and Congregationalists, they gave a public sanction to arminianism, pædo-baptism, and pseudo-episcopacy. Where such sacrifices are lightly made, it cannot be conscience that dictates a separation from the Church.

public meetings. Is it possible that ministers can have a proper sense of the great doctrines of the faith which they profess, while they unite as brother-dissenters with persons who labour to overthrow these doctrines from the very foundation? And is it probable that they will seriously and zealously enforce the truths which they thus practically undervalue?

When the London University was founded, the board of dissenting ministers took ten shares, the presentations upon which were to be given in preference to students for the ministry. It would be amusing were it not so lamentable, to see heresy and orthodoxy thus amicably united in promoting each other's views.

In the *Life of Toller*, by the late Robert Hall, it is stated that the academy at which he was educated for the ministry, was divided between Orthodoxy and Socinianism, the Principal encouraging the inexperienced young men to discuss the dangerous question freely, and maintaining a strict impartiality between the systems. Pass the mischief of sending out a number of young men with their faith shaken, or their principles corrupted, and overlook the unworthiness of the Principal; but what apology can be offered for the apathy of the great body of dissenters, who permitted the continuance of an evil which they had the power to correct; an evil so notorious at the time, as to attract the public commendation of Priestley?

Dissenters are not more contaminated by this familiar intercourse with heresy, than they are bewildered with their own doctrines. The creed they profess is Calvinism. What this creed really is, may be learnt from the Lambeth Articles, which the nonconformist divines proposed at the Hampton Court conference, to add to the articles of the Church.

"I. God from eternity hath predestinated some to life; some He hath reprobated to death.

"II. The moving or efficient cause of predestination to life, is not the foreseeing of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of any merit which is in the persons predestinated, but only the will of a reconciled God.

"III. Of the predestinated, there is a pre-ordained and fixed number, which can neither be increased nor diminished.

"IV. Those who are not predestinated to salvation, of necessity, on account of their offences, will be condemned.

"V. A true, a living, and a justifying faith, and the Spirit of the God who justifies, is not extinguished, nor cut off, nor fails in the elect, either finally, or totally.

"VI. A man truly faithful, *i.e.* endowed with the faith which justifies, is certain, from the full clearness of faith, of the remission of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation through Christ.

"VII. A saving grace is not distributed, nor communicated, nor granted to all men, by which they may be saved if they will.

"VIII. No man can come to Christ, except it shall have been given to him, and except the Father shall have drawn him: and all men are not drawn by the Father that they may come to the Son.

"IX. It is not placed in the will or power of any man whatever to be saved."

The mind recoils from doctrines which thus represent the sinner as a helpless victim, created for inevitable perdition, while the Deity mocks him with offers of salvation, which it is made impossible for him to accept. And can it be necessary to trace the evils connected with the profession of a creed, which even its followers shrink from defending?—a creed from which no practical good can be drawn, while its tendency is to the most awful practical error?—a creed, which tasks its advocates to the vain attempt to reconcile with laboured sophistry the most palpable contradictions, and to give plausibility to the worst absurdities?—a creed, which must be laid aside whenever practical duties are to be enforced?—a creed, which makes love to God a feeling impossible, even to the objects of his capricious choice,—as the favourites of an earthly tyrant, however they may exult in their own security, and rejoice in the advantages they derive from his favour, never can regard him with affection? This is no speculative question. Sound religious principles are the foundation of religious practice. But when principles are maintained which cannot be reconciled with the loveliest attributes of the Deity, homage will be offered only to His power. When incredible dogmas can be received, because they are the creed of a sect, the faith of the Bible may be admitted with as little examination, and held as lightly. When doctrines and duties cannot be reconciled, the Christian is left upon the most favourable supposition, without the support, the encouragement, and the energy, to be obtained from a true and living faith. Thus the Calvinist can derive no assistance from his creed, and must be good in spite of it. Like the blind man in the fable, he grasps a frozen serpent for a staff; and trusts to a support, useless in its torpor, and deadly in its activity.

The danger of mistaking profession for principle, is common to all Christians; but it applies with peculiar force to Dissenters. The condition of almost every chapel being a struggle for existence, all are required to exert themselves for its support; and this official attention to the interests of the cause, is very liable to be mistaken for personal religion. The extent of this mistake can be estimated only by those who have observed the general tone of conversation among Dissenters. Religion is scarcely ever introduced, except in connexion with the secular interests of the sect.

Another great source of self-deception is found in the personal consequence derived from admission to the privileges of church membership. A religious profession among Dissenters is the reverse of a cross. While the congregation are regarded as a distinct and inferior class, who are not allowed even a voice in the concerns of the chapel, the members assume exclusive power and importance; and the individual, whose youth, or station, could give him no claim to notice, acquires consequence by his admission into the privileged body. A religious profession will too often be made upon very questionable grounds, when it exacts no self-denial, and even ministers to the gratification of vanity.

Nor will the professor experience much difficulty in preserving his character for consistency, and his place in the "church," even though his religious feelings should decline. The technicals of a party, and

a speculative acquaintance with the doctrines of religion, are easily acquired in a degree sufficient for all the purposes of conversation, and even for assisting at a prayer-meeting, and occasionally filling a pulpit. The zeal of the partizan may be a satisfactory substitute for that of the Christian: and, if he abstain from the grosser sins which are discreditable even in the world, he may effectually conceal all inward rottenness under a whited exterior.

An awful proof of the low spirituality of Dissent, is found in the systematic exclusion of religion from its public establishments for education. The London University, upon which the curse of democracy and irreligion has rested from its foundation, affords, through its whole history, a memorable example and warning; and the same principle is acted upon, where the omission is far more injurious, in their schools for the education of the poor. When religion must be sacrificed for the sake of peace, the inference is inevitable, that the attention is habitually fixed, not upon the great truths which unite all Christians, but upon the petty distinctions of sect.

In considering the mode of public worship among Dissenters, we are at once struck with a fatal defect; the exclusion of the Scriptures. In their full services, only one psalm or chapter is read; in their prayer-meetings, not any. Do they imagine that a quarter of an hour cannot be advantageously spared for this purpose from a sermon of three times the length? Can they suppose the eloquence of man to be more powerful than the word of God? Is the minister averse to a plan which interferes with the display of his own talent; or would the people tire of the protracted reading? Is it consistent in those who profess to be more especially guided by the Scriptures, to exclude them from their public services? And dare they claim the character of superior spirituality for services thus essentially defective?

The long extempore prayer which forms so considerable a part of a dissenting service, is open to great objections. Deriving its character entirely from the minister, it makes him the chief object of attention; and whether his common-place be endured, or his eloquence respected, devotion is equally liable to be sunk in criticism or admiration. Being for the most part altogether unpremeditated, and necessarily comprehending a great variety of objects, it wants the arrangement and unity so indispensable for sustaining the attention, and aiding the memory. If the mind of the hearer remain quite passive, and prepared to assent to each successive petition, the effect will be too feeble to deserve the name of an impression: or, if it rouse itself to enter into the spirit of the prayer, the ideas awakened by association in the hearer, will constantly differ from those of the minister; and the two opposing trains of thought will thus act like central forces to carry him round in a circle that leaves him where he begun.

From these objections the Liturgy is altogether free. Its unrivalled excellencies secure it from tiring by repetition, while it is too familiar to divert the attention from its object to its beauties. It throws the minister out of view, for the congregation quickly become accustomed to his merits or defects as a reader. The smallest effort sustains the

attention, where the ideas follow in a known train; where the prayers have each its unity of character; where they are never so lengthened as to fatigue; where the different parts of the service are so disposed as to quicken by a pleasing variety; and where a large portion of it is assigned to the people themselves. And it includes a reading of the Scriptures, so extensive and well chosen, that hearers unable to read, may acquire from this source alone, a model for their devotions, and a competent knowledge of the truths of religion. It is an excellency peculiar to the Church, that she leads her flock to drink abundantly at the very source of the river of the waters of life.

There is a class, always a very numerous one, to whom the Liturgy is of peculiar value; those who are prevented by unavoidable causes from attending public worship. When the morning and evening services are read in the sick chamber, in a foreign land, or in the solitude of the great ocean, it is delightful still to feel bound to home, and to the sanctuary, by the holiest of ties. We feel that we are not solitary worshippers, while the lessons we read, and the prayers we offer up, are the same which on that day are an instruction and a blessing to millions.

In a published controversy at Manchester, a few years since, it was stated that the great majority of Socinian chapels in England, were originally orthodox endowments. No wonder! for Dissent has no practical standard of sound doctrine like the Liturgy; and the transition is not so difficult from scorning the festivals which commemorate the great truths of Christianity, to undervaluing the truths themselves.

If these remarks should be ascribed to an uncandid and bigoted spirit, the writer can affirm, that against such a spirit, he has striven earnestly and watchfully. Educated in all the prejudices of Dissent, and for many years a member of a dissenting "church," he has stated the evils which forced themselves upon his attention, and at length, notwithstanding every motive to be derived from personal feeling and worldly interest, drove him from its communion. His observations on the condition of Dissent, were made during a long series of years and upon a number of chapels, situated in different and distant parts of the kingdom. Such observations have a value for every one. From them, the Churchman may learn to prize his blessings; and the Dissenter may be taught a lesson of humility, charity, and forbearance, when he unexpectedly discovers material defects in those parts of his system which he had judged the most unassailable.

A CHURCHMAN FROM CONVICTION.

---

#### LAST WORDS OF THE DYING.

BISHOP JEWELL.—Overhearing one of his weeping friends praying that he might be restored to his former health, this admirable prelate addressed him in the following words of St. Ambrose, and shortly after expired:—"I have not so lived, that I am ashamed to live longer; neither do I fear to die, because we have a merciful Lord. A crown of righteousness is laid up for me: Christ is my Righteousness. Father, let thy will be done; Thy will, I say, and not my will, which

is imperfect and depraved. Lord, confound me not. This is my To-day. This day let me quickly come unto Thee. This day let me see the Lord Jesus."

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.—The last words of this illustrious martyr deserve to be recorded. When kneeling at the block, he thus prayed: "Lord, I am coming as fast as I can. I know I must pass through the shadow of death before I can come to thee; yet it is but *umbra mortis*, a mere shadow of death, a little darkness upon nature; but Thou, by thy merits and passion, hast broke through the jaws of death. So, Lord, receive my soul, and have mercy upon me, and bless this kingdom with peace and with plenty, and with brotherly love and charity; that there may not be an effusion of Christian blood amongst them; for Jesus Christ's sake, if it be thy will."

ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT.—The attachment of this great man to the interests of the Reformed Church was visible to the last hour of his existence, when, although his speech failed him in attempting to address James I. who was by his bedside, he was heard to repeat distinctly once or twice with great earnestness, and with eyes and hands lifted up, "*Pro Ecclesia Dei*"—For the Church of God. He appeared, indeed, to have some misgivings respecting the king's devotion to the Liturgy, if we may believe Camden—whose opinion is confirmed by Sanders, in his history of the same monarch, who puts the following words into the mouth of Whitgift when upon his death-bed:—"And now, O Lord, my soul rejoices that I die in a time when I would rather give an account of my bishopric to thee, than exercise it longer among men."

JOHN BRADFORD (*Martyr*).—This "holy" martyr being led to the stake in Smithfield by the persecuting ferocity of the papists, asked all the world forgiveness, and forgave all the world, and entreated the people to pray for him; then, turning his head towards the young man, who suffered with him, he said, "Be of good comfort, brother, for we shall have a joyful supper with the Lord this night;" after which, embracing the reeds, he added, "Strait is the way, and narrow is the gate, that leadeth unto eternal salvation; and few there be that find it."

THOMAS BILNEY (*Martyr*).—When led forth to the place of execution, one of his friends desired the sufferer to be constant, and endure the pangs destined for him with all the firmness and patience he could command;—to whom Bilney replied with "a quiet and mild countenance,"—"When the mariner undertakes a voyage, he is tossed on the billows of the troubled seas; yet, in the midst of all perils, he beareth up his spirit with this consideration, that, ere long, he shall come into his quiet harbour: so am I now sailing upon the troubled sea; but ere long my ship shall be in a quiet harbour; and I doubt not, but through the grace of God, I shall endure the storm; only I would entreat you to help me with your prayers." At the stake he made an explicit avowal of his faith, prayed earnestly to God for constancy and strength to endure his approaching trial; and after suffering the most excruciating torments, expired, calling upon the name of his God and Saviour.

## LAW REPORT.

## No. V.—BRAWLING IN A CHURCH.

IN THE COMMISSARY COURT OF THE DEAN AND CHAPTER OF WESTMINSTER.

1822.

CLINTON *v.* HATCHARD.

THIS was a proceeding by articles against Henry Hatchard, of the parish of St. Margaret, Westminster, at the promotion of the Rev. Dr. Charles Fynes Clinton, prebendary of the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, and incumbent Curate of the said parish. The articles, after pleading, first, the general law touching the orderly demeanour of persons who repair to their parish churches; and, secondly, that part of 5 and 6 Edward VI. c. 4, which respects quarrelling, chiding, or brawling, in any church, went on to charge, that the said Henry Hatchard did, in the afternoon of Sunday the 10th of December, 1820, whilst at the Church of St. Margaret, Westminster, and during the celebration of divine service therein, behave in an irreverent and disorderly manner, and annoy and interrupt the Rev. William Johnson Rodber, assistant Curate of the said parish, whilst he was passing from the vestry-room to the pulpit, and endeavour to prevent him from preaching a sermon therein—that he, the said Henry Hatchard, in order to effect his said purpose, had caused, or induced a number of persons to collect about the vestry door, by shouting, in a loud tone, "We want some friends about the vestry-room door;" so that the said Rev. William Johnson Rodber could, with difficulty, effect a passage from the said vestry-room to the pulpit—that, during the said Rev. William Johnson Rodber's passage from the said vestry-room towards the pulpit, the said Henry Hatchard took hold of his gown, and, addressing himself to him, said, "Here is Mr. Saunders, ready to do his duty; why wont you let him preach?"—that upon the said Rev. William Johnson Rodber's disengaging his gown, and still proceeding towards the pulpit, he, the said Henry Hatchard, followed him, repeating the word "Shame!" and

adding, in an angry, chiding, and reproachful manner, "For shame, Mr. Rodber! Mr. Saunders was regularly elected—why not let him preach? For shame!"—and that, by such irreverent and improper conduct, he, the said Henry Hatchard, greatly annoyed and disturbed, as well the said Rev. William Johnson Rodber in the performance of his duty, as the congregation then assembled in the said Church, for the purpose of divine worship.

A responsive allegation was given, and admitted, on the part of the said Henry Hatchard, which pleaded, in substance, that in the autumn of the year 1820, the afternoon parochial and unendowed lectureship of the parish of St. Margaret, Westminster, having become vacant, the Rev. Isaac Saunders, Rector of St. Ann's, Blackfriars, was chosen lecturer, against several competitors, by a majority of parishioners, at a poll taken by the Churchwardens on the 6th, 7th, and 8th of December in that year—that it being doubted, during the said election, whether Dr. Clinton, the incumbent, would grant Mr. Saunders the use of the pulpit, if elected, much curiosity was excited among the parishioners to know the result, which led to the assemblage of an unusual number of persons at the afternoon service, at St. Margaret's, on the ensuing Sunday, being the 10th of December—that, among others, the said Henry Hatchard went, and arrived there towards the conclusion of prayers; and having learnt, upon his arrival, that the said Mr. Saunders was in the vestry, he went thither to inquire whether he was, or was not, allowed to preach—that being answered by that gentleman in the negative, he withdrew from the vestry into one of the aisles of the Church, where, having learnt, soon afterwards, from one of the beadles, that the said Mr. Saunders had retired



into the Church-yard, upon the vestry being cleared, he also went there, and found him in conversation with a friend, who suggested that it would be proper to give formal notice to Mr. Rodber, the officiating Curate, that Mr. Saunders was in attendance, as a matter of courtesy; and that the said Henry Hatchard, as a supporter of the said Mr. Saunders, was a proper person to communicate such notice to Mr. Rodber—that the said Henry Hatchard thereupon proceeded towards the vestry, for the purpose so suggested; but that encountering Mr. Rodber in his way from the said vestry, which he had just left, to the pulpit steps, he said to him, in a very low tone of voice, and in a mild and respectful manner, “Mr. Rodber, Sir, the Rev. Isaac Saunders is here to perform the duty to which he has been elected”—that the said Rev. William Johnson Rodber, taking no notice thereof, the said Henry Hatchard immediately turned away, and left the said Church, which he did not re-enter during that afternoon—that, on the said Henry Hatchard so turning away, several persons cried out “Shame! Shame!” and “For shame, Mr. Rodber!” or to that effect; and there was a noise, and a hissing, and a considerable tumult in the said Church; but that the said Henry Hatchard took no part in the same—that he had not previously shouted or said, in a loud tone of voice, or otherwise, “We want some friends at the vestry-room door;” and that he did not, subsequently, accompany the said William Johnson Rodber towards the pulpit steps, exclaiming, “For shame, Mr. Rodber!” or to that effect; or address him in any other words than those before pleaded.

No evidence was adduced in support of this allegation; but three witnesses were produced and examined upon the articles.

Frederick Price, one of the bearers of the parish, deposed (in substance)—that he was at the parish Church of St. Margaret, Westminster, on the afternoon in question, and that, just after the evening prayers were finished, he observed Mr. Hatchard (whom he had never seen at the said Church before, but at a funeral, he being an

undertaker) standing very near the vestry door, by the deponent, whose office it was to attend the officiating Clergyman from the vestry to the pulpit—that he distinctly heard him say to a person who stood close to him, “We want a few persons near the vestry-room door”—that, as Mr. Rodber was passing from the vestry towards the pulpit, he was closely followed by Mr. Hatchard, who said to him, in the deponent’s hearing, plainly and distinctly, “Shame, Mr. Rodber! Mr. Saunders is regularly elected—why not let him preach?—for shame of you!”—that immediately upon Mr. Rodber’s ascending the pulpit, a number of persons began to hiss and shout, and call out “shame!”—whereby so great a tumult was excited, that a very few of the congregation could possibly distinguish Mr. Rodber’s sermon, although preached in his loudest tone,—and that after the service was over, the crowd, which was greater than ever the deponent had seen there, either before or since, would not quit the Church till a magistrate was sent for, and arrived from the Queen Square Police Office, accompanied by several constables—and that it was between five and six o’clock before the Church was cleared. This witness further deposed, that “although there was some talking, and a kind of murmuring noise, before Mr. Hatchard addressed Mr. Rodber, as above—yet there was nothing violent or outrageous until after he had so addressed him.”

The Rev. William Johnson Rodber (in substance) deposed, that on Sunday, the 10th of December, 1820, he attended the afternoon prayers at the parish Church of St. Margaret, Westminster, as the assistant curate of that parish—that as soon as the Clergyman who read the prayers, had finished, he left his pew, and retired to the vestry—that, on leaving the vestry for the pulpit, where the deponent was about to preach, his progress was impeded by a great number of people about the vestry-door, among whom was Henry Hatchard, the party proceeded against, so that the deponent had great difficulty in effecting a passage towards the pulpit—that he had proceeded but a short way from the

vestry, when he felt the left sleeve of his gown pulled, and heard his own name called out; whereupon he turned round, and saw the said Henry Hatchard, who immediately said, "Mr. Rodber, here is Mr. Saunders, ready to do his duty, will you choose to let him preach?" [The deponent says, that he had observed the said Rev. Mr. Saunders in the said Church during the afternoon prayers, and knew him to have been elected afternoon preacher, by the parishioners, although he had been denied the use of the pulpit, even for a probationary sermon, and had been told that it would still be denied to him, in the event of his being elected]—that the deponent did not make any reply to the said Henry Hatchard, but passed on—that the said Henry Hatchard kept close to the deponent; and, as he was passing near the rail of the altar, again addressed him, saying, angrily, "Mr. Rodber, why won't you let Mr. Saunders preach—he has been regularly elected!—for shame!"—that deponent still not answering, but forcing his way through the crowd, a most violent outcry and noise immediately took place—that in his passage through the crowd, to the pulpit steps, which the deponent, with difficulty, effected, by aid of two of the Church beadle, he was kicked till both his legs were black and blue, and hissed at, and spit upon—whilst there were many persons crying out, "Mr. Rodber, come back, don't disgrace yourself"—that the deponent delivered his sermon in the midst of an uproar, which continued during the whole service, and was loud enough, at times, to drown the sound of the organ, and the voices of the congregation and the charity children—that this uproar was such as the deponent had never, upon any occasion, before witnessed, and that after the service, the crowd was obliged to be dispersed by constables—that it was evidently the intention of the persons who hustled the deponent in his way to the pulpit, to prevent

him from reaching it—and that the said Henry Hatchard was principally instrumental in this attempt, and in exciting the tumult and disorder which otherwise existed in the said Church.

The evidence of John Woodward, also, one of the bearers of the parish, was precisely corroborative of that of Price, the first witness, and that of Mr. Rodber.

Judgment. — Dr. Swabey, [after stating the charge and recapitulating the evidence.]

Upon this view of the case I conceive it impossible to deny that the offence imputed to this defendant, and which, as appears, may be one of grave consequence, is brought home to him by the clearest and most indisputable evidence. In particular, no language can be a "chiding and brawling" within the statute of Edward VI., in a truer sense of the word than the defendant's expostulations, or remonstrances, with Mr. Rodber, as spoken to by the several witnesses, upon the occasion in question. The attempted justification set up (*in plea*) can be regarded in no other light than that of a mere pretext. Not only was a "formal notice" to Mr. Rodber that Mr. Saunders was in attendance purely superfluous, but its delivery can scarcely, I think, under the circumstances, be ascribed, by any stretch of charity, to a laudable motive. But be that as it may, it is certain that the scene of tumult and disorder which ensued was the actual, if it was not the designed, consequence of the delivery of this "notice" by the defendant; who therefore has been selected, in my judgment, with great propriety, as the person against whom these proceedings have been instituted. A very little inquiry, which it was his duty to have made, if inclined to meddle in this matter at all, would have instructed him, that in the case of every, at least unendowed, lectureship, no choice by the parish, of a Lecturer is effective, without the consent or approval of the Rector; \* whose

\* No person can be a Lecturer, endowed or unendowed, without the Rector's consent, unless there be an immemorial custom to elect without his consent—where there is such a custom, it is binding on the Rector, as it supposes a consideration to him. The endowment only seems material, in this respect, as it does (or may) furnish an argument in

undoubted right it is, in every such case, to grant to, or withhold from, the Lecturer so chosen, the use of his pulpit. At all events, however, he could not be ignorant that if Mr. Saunders had a legal right to the pulpit in the instance in question, there must be a legal mode of enforcing it—that any other mode of attempting to enforce it was as unjustifiable, as it must eventually prove unavailing; and that an appeal to private judgment, or rather to popular feeling upon such a subject (which this defendant's conduct amounted to, in my apprehension of it) was illegal as well as, in the highest degree indecorous.

It remains only to pronounce the

sentence of the law, which assigns to this species of offence, the offender being a layman, the penalty of suspension *ab ingressu ecclesiae*, for a discretionary period. I am induced to limit that period to one month only (to be computed from Wednesday next) in the present instance, from the circumstance of this defendant being an undertaker. I trust that he will be sensible of the lenity of the Court in this respect—and that, in future, he will be led to his parish Church by better motives, and conduct himself in it with greater caution and propriety.

I accompany this sentence of suspension with a decree for costs against Mr. Hatchard, as a matter of course.

---

## MONTHLY REGISTER.

---

### SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE, &c.

#### *Bath and Bedminster Committees.*

THE Nineteenth Anniversary Meeting of the Bath and Bedminster Committees of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and of the National Society for the Education of the Poor, was lately held at the Assembly Rooms. A most impressive excellent, and appropriate sermon was preached on the occasion at the Abbey Church in the morning, by the Rev. C. Trelawney Collins, M. A. The attendance at the Abbey, and also at the Rooms, was numerous and respectable in the highest degree. The Rev. Preacher selected his text from Galatians vi. 7, 8.

The business of the Meeting did not commence until nearly two, and terminated at a late hour in the afternoon.

The Rev. W. D. Willis rose to state that the issue from the Depository between the 1st of April, 1831, and April 1, 1832, had been of Bibles, 878; Testaments 780; Prayer-books

and Psalters, 2,661; Bound books, 2,747; School-books and Tracts, 23,834; shewing, on the whole, an increase of issues amounting to 4,776.

Two public district-meetings had been held in the Deanery of Bedminster, in the course of last year, at Wrington and Long Ashton; the result of which had been the diffusion of the knowledge, that such an Institution as this actually exists, and the acquisition of several Subscribers both to the Parent and District Fund.

The admirable institution by which upwards of 1,200 poor children of this city alone were instructed in the knowledge of God and the principles of their religion through the medium of the Holy Scriptures, needed all the support and assistance which every lover of Christianity, and friend of his country could bestow. The method proposed by the Committee was, to take upon itself the expense of providing those Bibles, Prayer-books, and

---

support of the custom, and to shew that it had a legal commencement. See 2 Str. 1192. 1 Wils. 11. *Rex v. Bishop of London*, 1 T. R. 331; and *Rex v. Field* and others, 4 T. R. 125. Even after the Rector's consent is obtained, the Bishop's license is also necessary—if not as forming part of the title of the Lecturer, still, at least, to exempt him from 13 & 14 Car. 2. c. 4. Vide 1 T. R. 331.

other works, which are given to the children upon their leaving school, the expense of which, even at the low sale at which they were supplied by the Committee to the schools, was considerable; and also, if it should be found necessary, defraying the whole expense of the books used in the various Sunday schools and daily schools of the establishment.

The Report then adverted to the School, at Combe Down, which had been considerably assisted, but that until the subscriptions for the Church were closed, the Committee did not feel themselves justified in making any further appeal on this behalf to the public.

In reference to the National School establishment in this city, it might not be out of place to mention, that at Weymouth House, there was a daily school for boys, in which 490 were now receiving an exclusively scriptural education, with the addition of writing and first simple rules of arithmetic. There was also a girl's daily school, containing, at present, 167 children; who, in addition to an education similar to that of boys, were taught the usual branches of knitting and needlework. Sunday schools for both sexes were also held at Weymouth House, and at eight other places in different parts of the city; a peculiar feature in these schools was, that in all of them efficient teachers were now employed in gratuitously assisting, and in some wholly conducting the instruction of the children, who had themselves received their education in the national schools. Many eloquent speeches were delivered at this Meeting, by the Reverends Willis, Mount, Brymer, Marriott, Fenwick, and Dewdney, which, had our limits permitted, we should have had pleasure in quoting.

—

*Ripon, Masham, and Aldborough  
District Committee.*

At the third general annual meeting of the members of this Society held at the Chapter-house, Ripon Minster, on Tuesday, the 31st of January, 1832, the Very Rev. the Dean of Ripon, President, in the Chair, the following is the substance of the Report, which

VOL. XIV. NO. VI.

was read by the Rev. Robert Poole, one of the Secretaries:—

Animated by the zealous exertions made in other parts of the Diocese of York, the Committee have actively stirred in their own field; and the result shews a proportionate increase in their receipts and distribution of books. It appears from the Treasurer's account, that the sum remitted in 1831 to the Parent Society, from this District, amounts to £296 13s. 7d., being £36 10s. 0d. in annual subscriptions, benefactions, and contributions; £9 5s. 8d. the amount of difference between the Society's reduced price as charged to the Committee, and the cost price on books issued to non-members of the Society, according to Rule 8; and £250 17s. 11d. for books sent to the Depository. The subscriptions and donations to the District Society amount to £80 19s. 0d., which, although liberal in the limited sphere of our District, leaves the Committee indebted to their Treasurer £32 15s. 7½d., and therefore calls for renewed exertions on the part of their friends. The number of books issued from the Ripon Depository in 1831, was 231 Bibles, 247 Testaments, 521 Common Prayer-books, 1521 Bound-books, and 4,537 Religious Tracts; making a total of 7,056, besides a considerable number of Cards to our National and Sunday Schools.

The Committee have the sincere satisfaction of knowing that within this District four Parochial Lending Libraries are already established, viz. at Ripon, Bishop-Monkton, Aldborough, and Bishop-Thornton.

Mention is then made of the Society's benevolent operations in promoting Christian education in every quarter of the Globe. The schools in connexion with the Society, and supported or assisted through its means, being scattered over the whole world: and its school books, and other religious works, are found in every town, village, and hamlet in the United Kingdom. Indeed, the assistance afforded to Infant, Sunday, and National Schools, through the Society, both at home and abroad, gives an interest and stimulus to all classes of the community, to unite for its encouragement and support.

ROBERT POOLE, Jun. } Secs.  
JAMES CHARNOCK, }

On the same day, the third general meeting of the members of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was held; the Report of which is little more than an epitome of that of the Parent Society. We are gratified, however, in saying that the balance

forwarded by the local Treasurer to the Parent Society amounts to 63*l.* 9*s.* 6*d.*

We would that our space allowed us to do justice to these and many other active and zealous members of our church, but we can only add that they deserve our best thanks.

#### NATIONAL SOCIETY.

At a General Committee held in the Vestry Room of St. Martin in the Fields, on Wednesday, the 16th ult. the Schools of nine places were re-

ceived into union. Grants were voted to several places for building School rooms, amounting to £270.

### POLITICAL RETROSPECT.

**DOMESTIC.**—It is our melancholy task to record what we consider tantamount to a revolution. On the 8th of May, the House of Peers having formed itself into a Committee on the Bill for the Reform of the Commons' House of Parliament, Lord Lyndhurst moved that the Schedules C and D, which determine the towns and cities to be enfranchised, should be taken into consideration before the Schedules A and B, which decide on the places to be disfranchised in whole or in part. After an animated debate, Ministers found themselves in a minority, there being

For the amendment .....	151
Against it .....	116

Majority for the amendment 35

They chose to consider this as the rejection of their measure; and Earl Grey immediately moved to postpone the further consideration of the Bill to the 11th of May. A Cabinet Council was held directly as the House adjourned, when it was resolved to demand from the King an immediate creation of new Lords, sufficient in number to make that House speak whatever language the Ministers might choose to dictate; and, if His Majesty should hesitate to comply, to tender their resignation. The King, true to his coronation oath to preserve the constitution entire, and maintain the efficiency of the three Estates of the kingdom, accepted their resignation; and having conferred with the Lord Lyndhurst on the circum-

stances in which he had been so unexpectedly placed, communicated to the Duke of Wellington, his wish that he should form a new Administration. The duke immediately entered upon negotiations for this purpose, which were continued till the 17th, when he was obliged to report their failure. The King thus situated, had no choice left him but to continue Earl Grey and his associates in office; and thus the Commons are made to reduce the two other Estates to a mere nullity. Their name continues, but their efficiency is gone.

The whole of the Schedules C and D, have since been gone through. A division took place on one of the most obnoxious clauses, but it was carried.

A Bill brought in by the Bishop of Durham, to establish an University there; and another by the Archbishop of Canterbury, to restrict Pluralities, are in progress through the House.

**FRANCE.**—The spirit of party and insubordination, continues to agitate the provinces. The government are very apprehensive of the influence of the Duchess de Berri, who is said to be hovering on the southern frontiers of the kingdom. The minister, Casimir de Perrier, is dead. Who is to succeed him, remains in uncertainty; Augustin de Perrier, the Duc de Cazès, and Marshal Soult, have all been spoken of, but the second has been attacked by, and is only slowly recovering from, the cholera; and the presence of the last will, probably, soon be again required in another

part of the kingdom. The ravages of the cholera are rapidly decreasing, particularly in the vicinity of Paris.

The government are making the most vigorous exertions in spite of all these difficulties, to gain a powerful foreign ascendancy. The navy occupies a large share of its attention. Thirty-two frigates, the least carrying 46 guns, seventeen mounting 52, and thirteen, 60 guns, are building in the different dock-yards. These ships can either serve as frigates, or fight in the line of battle as required. An agreement has been concluded between the Pope and the French Government, concerning the occupation of Ancona, much in favour of the latter, as it leaves the French troops in permanent occupation of a fortified rallying point, so long as the Austrians remain in the papal territories, and a place whence to commence operations, should a war break out in Italy, which seems very probable.

**HOLLAND AND BELGIUM.**—The King of the Netherlands continues to refuse his acceptance of the treaty of London, which has now been ratified by the five powers, yet with considerable reservations on the part of Prussia and Russia. The Belgium chamber has addressed the king in a most warlike tone; and he, in reply, assures them that he is identified with the Belgium nation. Movements of troops are taking place along the whole line of the frontiers. A change of Ministers is spoken of, and much agitated feeling prevails at Brussels. The Government are stated to experience no small anxiety as to the spirit which influences certain corps in the army.

**AUSTRIA.**—The army has been raised to the full war complement, and the Italian provinces are full of troops. Twenty thousand men are quartered in Milan;—the governors of Mantua and Peschiera are placed upon the war footing. Seventy-five thousand men are encamped on the Tessino, and another large army on the Adige. At Vienna every military preparation is complete. The Duke of Reichstadt (young Napoleon) is in a very dangerous state of health, and has requested to spend some months with his mother at Parma,

which has been refused. The popular attachment of the Italians to his father, which his presence might probably revive, is believed to be the cause of this refusal.

**RUSSIA.**—The Emperor has, by an imperial ukase, forbidden his subjects to play at cards, proportioning the penalties to the rank of the offender.

Severe measures continue to be adopted against the Poles. Not only have large levies of the peasantry been incorporated into the Russian army; but those young men, whose education and connexions might render them superior to mere bodily service, have been formed into regiments, and marched to do garrison duty in the Siberian fortresses; their names being suppressed, and they enrolled in their respective corps by numbers instead of names.

**PORTUGAL.**—The Madeiras are blockaded by a squadron of Don Pedro, who has not yet made his descent on Portugal. Don Miguel had, at the date of the last despatches, requested the British Admiral to withdraw his ships, as well as those of the merchants, from the Tagus; and his request had been complied with.

**TURKEY.**—The Sultan continues to press forward his plans for the civilization of his subjects, and with great promise of success, particularly in his attempt to introduce a taste for literature. Several elementary works have been published, and a few of a higher character in history and geography. A newspaper regularly issues from the imperial press, and is circulated through the empire. The war continues in Syria, and Acre is yet besieged.

**GREECE.**—The nomination of Prince Otho of Bavaria, to the throne of Greece, is very unpopular. The Greeks express themselves as wanting an able and efficient sovereign, not an infant.

**JAMAICA.**—The estimate of loss sustained by the insurrection in the parishes of St. James and Hanover, which principally suffered on the occasion, amounts to 2,000,000*l*.

**MEXICO.**—General Santa Anna has been entirely defeated by General Calderon, on the plains of Tolorne, eight leagues from Vera Cruz.

## UNIVERSITY, ECCLESIASTICAL, AND PAROCHIAL INTELLIGENCE.

\*\*\*\*\*

THE exquisitely beautiful church of Wrington, Somerset, (the proportions of which are perhaps unsurpassed), has recently been adorned with an altar-screen, worthy of its beauty. The absence of such an ornament was offensive to the taste of the parish and neighbourhood, and the present screen was accordingly erected by private subscriptions. The architect is Mr. Barry, of Foley Place, London; and the execution that of Mr. John White, formerly of Wrington, and now of Redcliff Hill, Bristol, celebrated for his taste in Gothic architecture.

The New Church of St. Saviour, Walcot, Bath, has been consecrated by the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells. In point of architectural beauty, both externally and internally, this Church is considered to be unrivalled by any ecclesiastical structure of modern date in that part of the country.

The New Church at Widcombe, near Bath, has been consecrated by the Lord Bishop of the diocese. An appropriate sermon was preached by the Vicar, the Rev. C. Crooke; and the music (chiefly from Handel) was under the direction of Mr. G. Field.

The Bishop of London will hold confirmations at the following times and places during the present month:—

St. John Hackney .....	Friday,	June 1,	at Eleven.
Islington .....	Friday,	— 1,	at Two.
St. Andrew Holborn .....	Monday,	— 4,	at Eleven.
Christ Church Newgate Street ...	Monday,	— 4,	at Two.
Kensington .....	Tuesday,	— 5,	at Eleven.
Chelsea .....	Tuesday,	— 5,	at Two.
St. Mary le Bone .....	Wednesday,	— 6,	at Eleven.
Hampstead .....	Wednesday,	— 6,	at Three.
Isleworth .....	Thursday,	— 7,	at Eleven.
Ealing .....	Thursday,	— 7,	at Three.
St. James Westminster .....	Friday,	— 8,	at Eleven.
St. Martin in the Fields .....	Friday,	— 8,	at Two.
Christ Church Spitalfields .....	Monday,	— 18,	at Eleven.
St. George in the East .....	Monday,	— 18,	at Two.

The Bishop of Lincoln intends to hold confirmations in Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, and Buckinghamshire, at the places, and on the days undermentioned:—

Hemel Hempstead, .....	Wednesday, June 6.
Berkhamstead, Tring, .....	Thursday, .. — 7.

The Bishop of Ely's Ordination will be held in London, on Sunday the 10th of June next.

In consequence of alleged bribery in a late election for the Afternoon Lectureship of St. Clement Danes, the Bishop of London has refused to license Mr. Denham, the successful candidate. Mr. Denham has since resigned.

It is said that the Bishop of London prohibited the performance of sacred music, announced to take place in St James's church, Colchester, on the 25th ult.

The Bishop of Calcutta will leave England, we are informed, on the 10th of this month.

The Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry preached a Charity Sermon on Sunday, May 13, at St. Bride's church.—On alighting from his carriage he was received with the most discordant groans and yells, and on entering the church, the sacredness of the place did not shield him from unequivocal marks of disapprobation. On ascending the pulpit, the groans and coughs became almost deafening, and being distinctly heard outside, were echoed by the assembled multitude. His Lordship prayed, but the people scoffed; and but few heard the text upon which he founded his discourse. He paused and stood firm, until the ebullition of feeling subsided, when he proceeded in the delivery of a discourse in a strain of eloquence for which he is so eminent, but he was often interrupted, and at



the conclusion, the clamour was as great as ever. Before his Lordship descended the pulpit, he addressed them, and hoped that they would reflect upon the consequence of committing outrage in the Church of God. He trusted, however, that they would not be punished by the civic authorities for their misconduct. On quitting the church, the bishop's carriage was followed by great numbers, but the exertions of the police prevented any stronger marks of dissatisfaction.

RE-OPENING OF YORK CATHEDRAL.—Shortly after six o'clock on Sunday morning, the 6th ult., the bells commenced a peal, which was continued without cessation till nearly eight o'clock. So early as nine o'clock, numbers had congregated about the doors of the cathedral, and the throng continued to augment until the hour of their being opened, ten o'clock. At half-past ten o'clock, divine service was commenced by the Rev. James Richardson. The Litany was read by the Rev. W. Richardson, and the Communion Service by the Rev. C. Hawkins, Canon Residentiary, and the Ven. and Rev. Archdeacons Harcourt and Markham. The Very Rev. the Dean, preached an eloquent and impressive sermon.

LADY CHAPEL.—Tuesday, the 1st ult. a general meeting of the committee for promoting the restoration of the Lady Chapel, attended by numerous scientific gentlemen, was held at the Nag's head, Borough, to consider Mr. Gwill's gratuitous offer to superintend the restoration of the same. After some discussion, it was unanimously resolved that the offer of the above-named gentleman should be accepted, with a perfect understanding by all the parties, that the expense of repair should not exceed 2500*l*. The further consideration of the subject was adjourned to the eighth, when the drawings, plans, &c., were to be submitted for approval, previous to the ultimate decision, which was to guide the committee in their views of establishing this venerable edifice in its pristine beauty. A model was exhibited to the meeting, which gave a pleasing idea of what the Chapel will be in a renovated state.

At the church of St. Nicholas, Worcester, on the afternoon of Sunday the 6th inst., the rite of baptism was administered by the Rev. H. J. Lewis, to a young German Jew. It appears that during an illness, while he was in lodgings, he enquired for a book, when a Bible was put into his hands. Before this, he had not an opportunity of seeing the New Testament or the Prophecies. Upon comparing the latter with the former, doubts arose in his mind, and he at length, by intercourse with clergymen of the Church of England, became convinced that Jesus was the Messiah foretold in the Books of the Old Testament. Professing his desire to be admitted into the Christian communion, his wish was complied with.

The Rev. Lord A. Fitzclarence, Rector of Mapledurham, Berks., resides there, and is said to perform the spiritual duties of his parish in a most exemplary manner: his Lordship lately presented a magnificent service of Communion plate, valued at 300 guineas, and his Majesty, some months since, gave £100 towards erecting a parochial school, and has ordered a clock of 100 guineas to be erected in the church.

On Sunday, May 6, after a very impressive sermon by the Rev. Temple Chevalier, in St. Mary's church, Newmarket, £28 were collected in aid of the National School funds.

The Head Mastership of the Charter-house has become vacant by Dr. Russell's acceptance of the Living of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate. The Rev. E. Churton, the Rev. J. S. Boone, and the Rev. Dr. Sanders, are candidates for the appointment.

PROTESTANT AND POPISH CONTRIBUTIONS.—*Mr. Boyton's Speech, delivered at a late Conservative Meeting.*—The collection made on behalf of the distressed manufacturers in Dublin, in the winter of 1829 and 30, was, from 471 Protestants, 3554*l*. 10*s*. 10½*d*.; from 38 Roman Catholics, 192*l*. 13*s*.; Total, 3747*l*. 3*s*. 10½*d*. But from the Roman Catholic contributions, may be deducted the following, as from public characters:—Messrs. Sweetman, brewers, 50*l*.; Messrs. Conlan, 20*l*.; D. O'Connell, Esq. M. P. 20*l*.; Total, 90*l*. Remainder of subscriptions from the whole Roman Catholic body 102*l*. 13*s*.

There is another charity, viz. the Tuam Dispensary. Subscriptions for the year ending June 30, 1831:—from Protestants, 136*l*. 18*s*. 5*d*.; Roman Catholics, 37*l*. 7*s*.; Total, 175*l*. 5*s*. 5*d*. Relieved in the same year:—Protestants, 64; Roman Catholics, 4494; Total, 4558.

By these returns it will be seen, that while factious demagogues are inflaming the public mind, and parish orators disturbing the legal proceedings at vestries, and protesting against the sums necessary for the decent performance of divine worship; the Protestants of Ireland are, in point of fact, supporting at their own cost, and by voluntary contributions, the whole of the Popish pauperism of the country.

ANTHEMS, &c. as performed at the Anniversary Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on Thursday, May 17, 1832.—Before the Service, the *Dettingen te Deum*: (Handel) which occupied fifty-five minutes. *Cantate Domino*: Attwood. *Deus Misericatur*, with *Gloria Patri*: Handel. After the Third Collect, Grand Chorus (Messiah): Handel. Immediately before the Sermon, Anthem, composed by Dr. Boyce, expressly for this Charity, "Lord, thou hast been our refuge." The Sermon was preached from Psalm cxiii. 6—9. by the Rev. William Dealtry, D.D. F.R.S. After the Sermon, the Grand Coronation Anthem: Handel. The only Bishops present, were the Bishop of Llandaff, the Bishop of Hereford, and the Bishop of Calcutta. The usual dinner did not take place at Merchant Tailors' Hall. The collection made at the Cathedral on the day of the Rehearsal, amounted to 103*l.*; on the 17th, 216*l.*; Total, 319*l.* This sum, together with the Stewards' fines (50*l.* each) and donations, will much exceed 1,000*l.*

Sir Eardley Wilmot, Bart. in addition to letting plots of land, at a moderate rent, to the labourers of his parish for gardeners, as an incentive to industry and good conduct, has offered premiums for their proper cultivation.

The Hon. Mr. Spencer, who lately conformed to the Roman Catholic religion, has been very ill at Rome, from the rupture of a blood vessel, owing to debility produced by his great exertions in his new calling, and the fasting enjoined by his church.

WELLS.—We have the pleasure of recording another act of disinterested generosity on the part of the worthy and benevolent Bishop of this diocese; whose attentions are not confined to ameliorating the condition of the poor at Wells and its environs, but his kindness is extended to benefit all classes. His Lordship, on hearing that there was a difficulty in providing suitable accommodations for the Judges at the next Assizes, has spontaneously offered his Palace for their reception; and he did this with so much delicacy and promptitude, that cannot fail to make a lasting impression on the inhabitants of this city, for his generous devotion to their interests.

The sums received by churchwardens in England and Wales, from Easter 1830 to Easter 1831, was 446,247*l.* 12*s.*; in church rates, 51,910*l.* 1*s.*; from estates, 18,216*l.*; from mortuary or burial fees, 41,919*l.* 17*s.*; poor rates, 39,382*l.* 12*s.*; pews and sittings, and from other sources not stated, 66,559*l.* 16*s.*—total, 663,814*l.* 18*s.* Of which was expended, in repairs of churches, &c. 248,125*l.* 16*s.*; organs, bells, &c. 41,710*l.* 15*s.*; books, wine, &c. 46,337*l.* 19*s.*; salaries to clerks, sextons &c. 126,185*l.* 17*s.*; any other purpose (principally visitation fees and travelling expenses) 183,523*l.* 2*s.* Total, 645,883*l.* 9*s.*

ST. ALBAN'S ABBEY.—Some time since, part of the south wall of the great nave of this venerable fabric fell in upon the roof of the side aisle, through which it broke. The parochial authorities immediately called in the assistance of a competent architect, and convened a meeting of the parish, by which the architect was directed to make a report of the repairs necessary for the preservation of the fabric, and the estimated expense. The report has been made, and the expense estimated at 14,000*l.* The Abbey is but a parish church, for which purpose a very small part of it is only used, and the funds of the parish are wholly inadequate to uphold so vast an edifice; and the parishioners have determined to appeal to the liberality of the nation, to preserve from ruin this venerable edifice, so interesting to every lover of the history and antiquities of this country. A public meeting has been held for the purpose, at which Lord Verulam presided, when resolutions were proposed and adopted to the effect that the meeting saw with regret the serious accident that had befallen this venerable edifice, and strongly recommended a public meeting at the Thatched-house Tavern, in St. James's-street, to carry into effect the objects of the meeting. The Bishop of London has written a letter to the Rev. Mr. Small, the Rector of St. Alban's, expressing his desire for the preservation of the ancient edifice; and enclosing a donation of 200*l.*

The Rev. Dr. Routh, President of Magdalen College, and Rector of Tilehurst, at his audit, on Thursday se'nnight, made a reduction of 10 per cent. on the tithes of that parish.

The public dinners commenced at Lambeth Palace on Saturday the 12th of May. The Service in the Chapel commences at half-past six precisely. Those who intend to honour the Archbishop of Canterbury with their company, are requested to send their names before twelve o'clock on the previous day.

The commissioners appointed to investigate the public charities have lately been at St. Alban's. It is said they intend to order all the wills connected with the different bequests to be published. A notice board is also to be placed in the Abbey Church, specifying the titles of, and donors to, the different charities in the town.

The parish officers of Marylebone have already been called upon to pay upwards of 1600*l.* for expenses incurred by the local Board of Health.

A Second Master is, we understand, wanted for the Blackheath Proprietary School. Candidates must be Members of the Church of England, and Graduates of Oxford, Cambridge, or Dublin. Salary 250*l.* per annum. Any personal canvass will disqualify. The duties of the Office will commence on the 23rd July next.

The opening of the Organ in the Parish Church of All Saints, Oxford, on Sunday, May 6th, was to an overflowing congregation; indeed, many were obliged to leave for want of accommodation. The Service was well sustained by the Christ Church Choir; and Mr. William Marshall did not fail to put to the test the character which had been given of this Organ for power and sweetness of tone; and it was fully proved that it had not been overrated. The organ possesses an octave and a half of German Pedals, as well as five Composition Pedals, with other improvements not yet introduced into any of the other Organs in this University or City. An appropriate and eloquent Sermon was delivered by the Rev. Edward Hawkins, Provost of Oriel College, after which the collection amounted to 50*l.*

We are glad to see another attempt to set on foot a Periodical in Oxford. In so literary a society, it can scarcely fail to meet with due support. The present plan is more certain of success than any previously formed, for many obvious reasons; especially that the expense of the work is proportioned to the number of subscribers, and that no productions are to be admitted but those approved of by selected judges.

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, BEDFORD.—On Sunday, April 22d, this church was opened, after having undergone extensive improvements and repairs. The galleries have been considerably enlarged and the pews newly arranged, by which, the accommodations of the congregation have been greatly increased. The new situations of the pulpit and organ are very advantageous and convenient. The alterations are not yet fully completed. The annual Infirmary sermon was preached on the following Sunday by the Rev. Mr. Wellesley, vicar of Selsoe-with-Flitton.

On Wednesday, the 25th April, the anniversary meeting of the patrons of Rugby School, and the public recitation of the prize compositions by the scholars, took place. At one o'clock, Dr. Arnold, and Dr. Wooll, the late Master, entered the exhibition room, which was very fully attended. The Latin Prize Poem, "*Venctia*," was awarded to Mr. C. Mayor, son of the Rev. James Mayor, of South Collingham, near Newark. The English Prize Poem, "*Charles Martel*," was given to Master A. P. Stanley, second son of the Rev. E. Stanley, of Alderley, near Knutsford. The Latin Prize Essay, "*De Crameri moribus et vitæ exitu*," was given to Master W. Alexander Greenhill, the son of George Greenhill, Esq. of the Stationers' Company. The English Prize Essay, "*On Novels and Novelists*," was given to Master A. P. Stanley. In the 5th form, the English Prize Essay, "*On the Literature of the reign of George II.*" was given to Mr. H. Mills, son of the Rev. F. Mills, of Barford. The prizes awarded consisted of valuable classical and other works. Seven of the scholars then recited various recitations, both Latin and English.

LEVELLING AND IMPROVING PARKER'S PIECE, CAMBRIDGE.—Mr. Watford has completed his plans and design for the above purpose. Mr. W. considers that it will be highly improper to publish the estimate, as it would be giving contractors an undue advantage.—Mr. W. suggests that Ebenezer Foster, Esq., Charles Humfrey, Esq., Thomas

Fisher, junior, Esq., F. D. Barker, Esq., Julian Skrine, Esq., and Thomas Hovell, Esq., be appointed the committee for carrying the proposed measure into effect, with power for three to act; and to add to the committee if they should deem it needful. That Charles Finch, senior, Esq. should be proposed as the treasurer. If sufficient funds cannot be obtained to effect the measure, the parties depositing their contributions will have timely notice that the money will be returned under the order of the treasurer. Mr. W. considers that the contributions being paid into the banks, affords the most convenient method of ascertaining the possibility of effecting the measure. Mr. W. has been asked by a contributor whether it be his intention to withdraw his professional assistance, from what appeared in his last address to the respective Editors of the Papers.—Mr. W. replied that whatever construction might be put on the language of his last address, he merely meant to say, that his nephew, Mr. Richardson, would be happy to attend to the orders of the committee in his absence from Cambridge; and that he and Mr. Richardson mean in every respect to give up their time gratuitously to the promotion of the undertaking.—Gentlemen of the university and town of Cambridge, are particularly requested to send their contributions to the banks, in order that it may be seen whether the amount will meet the desired end or not. Nearly 70*l.* have already been subscribed.

At a meeting of the trustees of Crane's charity for the town of Cambridge, on the 3d ult., Mr. Frederick Cory was elected to the office of Secretary to the charity, vacant by the death of Mr. Alderman Ingle. And at the half yearly meeting, the sum of £37 was ordered to be distributed among sixty-seven poor applicants.

The next Presentation to the Rectory of Carby, in the county of Lincoln, is to be sold by Private Contract. The annual value is 300*l.* wholly arising from Glebe.—Carby is within 5 miles of Stamford.

The Anniversary Meeting of the gentlemen educated at Merchant Taylors' School, will be held at the Albion, Aldersgate Street, on Tuesday, June 12, at half-past five.

#### CLERICAL APPOINTMENTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Appointment.</i>
Bateman, Josiah ....	{Chapl. to the Hon. E. I. C. in India, and Chapl. to the Bp. of Calcutta.
Merewether, John ..	Supernumerary Deputy Clerk. of the Closet to His Majesty.
Robson, R. S. ....	Chapl. to the Earl of Balcarras.

#### PREFERMENTS.

The King has been pleased to order a *cong   d'elire* to pass the great seal of the united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, empowering the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Hereford to elect a Bishop of that See, the same being void by the death of Dr. George Isaac Huntingford, late Bishop thereof; and his Majesty has also been pleased to recommend the Honourable and Reverend Edward Grey, Doctor in Divinity, to be elected by the said Dean and Chapter, Bishop of that See.

The King has been pleased to order a letter to be directed to the Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, recommending to them the Rev. John Merewether, A.M., to be chosen in the place of Dean of the said Cathedral Church, void by the promotion of the Rev. Dr. Edward Grey to the see of Hereford.

The King has also been pleased to present the Rev. John Merewether, A.M. to the Prebend of Piona Parva, founded in the Cathedral Church of Hereford, void by the promotion of the Rev. Edward Grey to the see of Hereford.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
Churton, John Fred.	Threapwood, P. C.	Flint	Chester	Bp. of Chester
Clark, Geo. Croly ..	Bondleigh, R.	Devon	Exeter	Hon. P.C. Wyndham
Coldwell, Thomas ..	Abthorpe, C.	Northam.	Peterboro	Bp. of Lich. & Cov.
Crompton, T. ....	Hackford, R.	Norfolk	Norwich	T. T. Gurdon, Esq.
Dyke, Thomas Hart .	Longnewton, R.	Durham	Durham	Bp. of Durham
Gunn, William ....	{Gorleston, R. with South Town, R. and West Town, C.	Norfolk	Norwich	Lucy Browne
Hassall, James ....	Toxteth Park, St. John, C.			
		C. Lancaster	Chester	R. of Walton.

Name.	Preferment.	County.	Diocese.	Patron.
Hook, Walter F. . .	{ Chaplain in ordinary to His Majesty and Preb. in Cath. Church of York and Coventry, Trin. V. to Preb. in Cath. Ch. of Lincoln	Warwick	Lichfield	Abp. of York Lord Chancellor Bp. of Lincoln
Jenks, John . . . . .	Thriplow, V.	Camb.	Ely	Bp. of Ely
Jones, John Pyke . .	Butterleigh, R.	Devon	Exeter	Lord Chancellor
Kershaw, G. W. . . .	Charsfield, P. C.	Suffolk	Norwich	Earl Howe
Law, F. . . . .	Samlesbury, C.	Lancaster	Chester	V. of Blackburne
Litler, Robert . . . .	{ Chadkirk, C. to Pointon, P. C.	{ Chester	Chester	{ R. of Stockport Lady Vernon
M'Grath, H. W. . .	Walton le Dale	Lancaster	Chester	V. of Blackburne
Noel, Hon. Leland . .	Exton, V.	Rutland	Peterboro	Sir G. N. Noel, Bt.
Phillips, W. Spencer	{ Devunnuck, R. with Blaen Glyn Towy, C.	{ Brecon	St. David's	Bp. of Gloster
Pidsley, Sydenham . .	Uplowman, R.	Devon	Exeter	
Richards, Russell . .	Ilketshall, St. John's, V.	Suffolk	Norwich	Lord Chancellor
Richardson, William	{ Crambe, V. and Hutton Ambo, P. C.	{ N. York	York	Abp. of York
Robson, R. S. . . . .	{ Ranciliff, C. to Whitgift, C.	{ W. York	York	N. E. Yarburgh, Esq.
Russell, John, D. D. .	St. Botolph, Bishopsg. R.	London	London	The King
Sandby, George . . .	{ South Elmham, All Sts. and ——— St. Nich. R. to Reddingfield, C.	{ Suffolk	Norwich	Alex. Adair, Esq.
Saunders, Aug. Page	Ravensthorpe, V.	Northam.	Peterboro	Ch. Ch. Oxford
Stewart, John . . . .	Thwaite, All Saints, R.	Norfolk	Norwich	Bp. of Norwich
Templer, John . . . .	Teigngrace, R.	Devon	Exeter	Duke of Somerset
Tyley, James . . . . .	Great Addington, R.	Northam.	Peterboro	Rev. J. Tyley
Venables, R., D. D. .	{ Preb. of Cath. Ch. of Brecon and Clyro, R. with Llanbadarn y Gareth, C. and Nantmel, V. with Llanyre, C. and Newchurch, R. to Archdn. of Carmarthen	{ Radnor	St. David's	{ Bp. of St. David's
Vicary, Abm., T. R. .	{ Priest Vic. of Cath. Ch. of Exeter to Exeter, St. Paul, R.	{ Devon	Exeter	{ D. & C. of Exeter
Watkins, Chas. Fred.	Brixworth, V.	Northam.	Peterboro	Ch. of Cath. of Sarum
Wilkins, Geo. D. D. .	{ Preb. in Coll. Ch. of Southwell and Lowdham, V. & Nottingham St. Mary, V. to Archdn. of Nottingham	{ Notts.	York	{ Earl Manvers Abp. of York
Witts, Francis Edward	East Lulworth, V.	Dorset	Bristol	

## CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

On Sunday, April 29th, in his 84th year, the Right Rev. George Isaac Huntingford, D.D. F.R.S. Lord Bishop of Hereford, Warden of Winchester College, and formerly a Fellow of New College, Oxford. The Right Rev. Prelate was consecrated Bishop of Gloucester in 1802, and was translated to Hereford in 1815, on the removal of Dr. Luxmore to St. Asaph. His lordship was elected Warden of Winchester College in 1789. During a period of upwards of forty years, he discharged the multifarious business of the wardenship, and subsequently of the dioceses of Gloucester and Hereford, the latter a very extensive one, in his own hand-writing, except when prevented by extreme illness. He was seldom known to have erred in any episcopal decision that he ever gave, to which he was in the habit of applying all the faculties of a mature judgment, assisted in difficult cases by the aid of ecclesiastical counsel; which, however, usually confirmed the original bias of his discerning mind. His knowledge of Grecian literature was deep and extensive, and only equalled by his unfeigned piety, Christian humility, and benevolence. His memory will long be affectionately cherished by the society of which he was warden, and by the Clergymen of his successive dioceses, to whom he was a friend and father. The Bishop published some discourses and other theological works. He was the author of "The Introduction to the Writing of Greek;" a book which is used,

we believe, in all the classical seminaries in the kingdom. He took his degree of M.A. June 28, 1776, and of B. and D.D. March 21, 1793.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
Boldero, William ....	{ Carlton, R. with Willingham, C. }	Camb.	Ely	Lord Daire
	{ and Woodford, R. }	Essex.	London	{ Hon. W. T. L. P. Wellesley
Browne, Thomas, D.D.	{ Gorleston, R. with South Town, R. and West Town, C. }	Suffolk	Norwich	Mrs. Astley.
Comins, John .....	Rackenford, R.	Devon	Exeter	Thos. Comins, Esq.
Deans, James .....	Cottingham, V.	E. York	York	Bp. of Chester
Fowle, Thos. Hartland	{ Thornton le Street, R. with N. Otterington, V. }	N. York	York	Ch. Ch. Oxford
Leathes, Chal. Stanley..	Ellesborough, R.	Bucks	Linc.	R. G. Russell, Esq.
M'Culloch, Thomas....	Wormley, V.	Herts	Pec.	Sir. A. Hume, Bart.
Moore, George .....	{ Preb. in Cath. Ch. of and Ladock, R. }	Lincoln		Bp. of Lincoln
	{ and Merthyr. V. }	Cornwall	Exeter	Ld. & Ly. Grenville
Nicholson, William ....	Bramshot, R.	Hants	Winchest.	Qu. Coll. Oxford.
Payne, Henry Thomas	{ Can. Res. of Cath. Ch. of St. David's and Archdn. of Carmarthen and Preb. in Coll. Ch. of Brecon and Devunnuck, V. }			{ Bp. of St. David's
	{ with Blaen Glyn Towy, C. }	Brecon	St. David's	Bp. of Gloster
	{ Queen's Camel, V. and Puddimore Milton, R. Fifehead, V. }			{ Miss Ann Mildman T.S. Horner, Esq.
Pearson, Thos. Horner	{ and Merriott, V. and Swell V. }	Somerset	B. & Wells	D. & C. of Bristol
Price, Thomas .....	{ Fell. of Jes. Coll. Camb. and Gt. Wilbraham, V. }	Camb.	Ely	Mrs. Hicks
Studholme, Joseph....	Langford, R.	Essex	London	Mrs. Westcombe
Westcombe, W. ....				

#### OXFORD.

##### ELECTIONS.

AN Election will be held in Corpus Christi College, Oxford, on Friday, the fifteenth of June next, of two Scholars, one for the County of Surrey, and the other for the Diocese of Durham.

Any persons are eligible who are natives of the above County or Diocese, and who may not have exceeded their nineteenth year on the day of election.

All Candidates must appear personally before the President on the ninth of June preceding, and must produce certificates of the marriage of their parents, and of their own baptism; an affidavit of their parents, or some other competent person, stating the day and place of their birth; and a testimonial of their previous good conduct from the Tutor of their College, or the Head Master of their School.

*Senior Proctor.* — The Rev. Francis Clerke, M. A. late Fellow of All Souls' College.

*Junior Proctor.* — The Rev. Richard Young, M.A. Fellow of New College.

*Pro-Proctors.* — Rev. James Bullock, M.A. Fellow of Worcester College; William Falconer, M.A. Fellow of Exeter College; Rev. Thos. Forster, M.A. New College; Geo. Robert Michael Ward, M.A. Fellow of Trinity College.

The Rev. Robert Speccatt Barter, B.C.L. and Fellow of New College, has been elected by that Society to the Wardenship of Winchester College, vacant by the death of the late Bishop of Hereford.

The Rev. Frederick Nolan, D.C.L. of Exeter College, has been appointed by the Heads of Colleges to preach the Bampton Lectures in 1833.

Mr. Digby Octavius Cotes, has been elected Scholar of University College, on the Yorkshire Foundation.

Messrs. Humfry, Gardiner, and Burdon, Undergraduate Commoners of Lincoln College, have been elected Lord Crew's

Exhibitioners; and Messrs. West, of Lincoln College, and Hannam, of St. John's College, have been elected Scholars.

In Convocation, the sum of £900 was voted from the University Chest, for the extra repairs and furniture required for the rooms in the Clarendon Building.

DEGREES CONFERRED.

BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

Rev. Edw. Bouverie Pusey, Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Hebrew, Grand Comp.

Rev. D. Veysie, Censor of Christ Church.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

R. C. B. Clayton, Brasenose Coll. Grand Comp.

Rev. W. M. K. Bradford, Magdalen Hall.

Rev. C. T. Cary, Magdalen Hall.

Rev. H. J. Morshead, Exeter Coll.

A. Morgan, University, Grand Comp.

Rev. F. Morgan, St. John's, Grand Comp.

Rev. C. H. W. Alston, St. Mary Hall.

Jasper Nicolls Harrison, Worcester.

G. S. Casement, Christ Church.

Rev. Alexander Murray, Magdalen Hall.

Thomas Denman Whatley, Queen's.

John Griffith Cole, Fellow of Exeter.

Edward Arthur Dayman, Fell. of Exeter.

Rev. Thomas Page, Magdalen Hall.

Stephen Gaselee, Balliol Coll.

James Hussey, Balliol Coll.

George Eaton, Brasenose Coll.

Henry Raymond Barker, Merton Coll.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

William Henry Bloxsome, Wadham Coll.

Harry Vane Russell, Corpus.

Forster Alleyne M'Geachy, Balliol.

John William Pugh, Balliol.

R. Lloyd, Brasenose, incorporated from Trinity Coll. Dublin.

W. H. H. Beach, Oriel Coll. Grand Comp.

Francis Palmer, Christ Church.

William Mears, Queen's Coll.

John Fisher, Queen's Coll.

CAMBRIDGE.

ELECTIONS.

The Rev. Harry Longueville Jones, M.A. and the Rev. George Urquhart, B.A. of Magdalene College, have been elected Foundation Fellows of that society.

George Stovin Venables, B.A. Scholar of Jesus College, in this university, has been elected a Fellow of that society.

William Dixon Rangeley, and John Newton Peill, have been elected Foundation Fellows of Queen's College.

Charles Davidson, B.A. of Christ College, has been elected a Fellow of that society, on the foundation of Sir John Finch and Sir Thomas Baines.

The following gentlemen of Trinity College have been elected Scholars of that society :—

Walford,	Forsyth,
Barnes,	Selwin,
Feachem,	Hoare.
Wright,	<i>Westmin. Scholars.</i>
Lawrence,	Hue,
Phelps,	Ellison,
Marsh,	Gwilt,
Stevenson,	White.

DEGREES CONFERRED.

HONORARY MASTERS OF ARTS.

The Hon. Musgrave Alured Henry Harris, (son of the late Lord Harris,) Corpus Christi Coll.

Hon. Frederick Henry Yelverton Powys, (grandson of the late Lord Lilford,) Emmanuel Coll.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

George James Cubitt, Caius Coll.

William Ladds, Caius Coll.

Rev. George Phillips, Queen's Coll.

Henry Philpott, Fellow of Catharine Hall.

Chas. Lesingham Smith, Fell. of Christ's Coll.

Rev. Edm. H. Hopper, Fell. of Christ's Coll.

BACHELOR IN PHYSIC.

John Okes, Sidney Coll. Grand Comp.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Michael Nihell Bovell, Trinity Coll.

James Hayworth, Trinity Coll.

John Bayley Darvall, Trinity Coll.

William Milne, St. John's Coll.

John Daniel, St. John's Coll.

John Jones, St. John's Coll.

William Spence, St. John's Coll.

Charles Bowen, St. Peter's Coll.

Thomas Dennett West, St. Peter's Coll.

Francis Du Boulay, Clare Hall.

Rev. William Sloman Rowe, Queen's Coll.

William Acworth, Queen's Coll.

John Knight, Queen's Coll.

Edward Robert Lascelles, Catharine Hall.

John Witherington Peers, Catharine Hall.

William Haymond, Jesus Coll.

Thomas James Scalé, Jesus Coll.

Thomas A. Roper, Madalene Coll.

George Baker Garrow, Emmanuel Coll.

Rev. Alex. P. Birrell, Sidney Coll.



## PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

A meeting of the Philosophical Society was held on Monday evening, May 7, Professor Sedgwick, the president, being in the chair. Several presents were announced to the society; among the rest a box of Brazilian insects from A. Badger, Esq. of Trinity College; the volume of the Cambridge Observations for 1831 (the 4th volume) presented by the Plumian Professor; the Transactions of the Geological Society; of the Society of Arts, and other books. A paper by Sir John F. W. Herschel, fellow of the society, was read, containing a description of a machine for solving equations. A notice was also read of a visit by W. H. Yates, Esq. of St. John's college, to the magnetic mountain of Sipylus near Magnesia, in Asia Minor; the mountain from which the *magnet* is said by Pliny to have derived its name. After the meeting, Professor Sedgwick gave an account, illustrated by maps, of the physical geography, and the history of the Bedford Level. It was stated that originally the river at Lynn drained only the eastern part of the district, bordering on this low fenny region, and the waters of the country about Cambridge, Huntingdon and Peterborough, as well as the more remote parts of the neighbouring counties, were discharged by the mouth of the river at Wisbech. About 1280, the Ouse, between Ely and Lynn, was relieved by a cut from Priest-houses to Rebeck, discharging the waters of the Cam and Ouse into the Brandon river. The consequence of this was, that not only the waters of the Cam and Ouse, but also those of the Nen and Welland, found their way to the sea at Lynn—the two latter rivers pouring their waters backwards through the inoculating branches, by which they had formerly descended to the sea below Wisbech. Thus the mouth of the Lynn river became the vent of

nearly all the waters of the Bedford Level. Various attempts were made by Bishop Langton and others (in 1292,) to remedy the inconvenience which thus arose by pouring additional waters into the Lynn river; but these produced a still greater evil in flooding the country along the course of the Ouse, and were finally abandoned. In 1490, Bishop Morton protected the country below Peterborough by the *team* or dyke which still bears his name. The greatest change, however, which has occurred in this region, was produced by the old and new *hundred-foot* drains, executed by the Earls of Bedford about 1630 and 1650. These discharge, by direct and short passages, the waters which formerly ran round from Earith by Ely to Denver's sluice; and in doing this the undertaking was entirely successful; the effect having been, for instance, almost entirely to obliterate the river which formerly ran from Earith to Streatham, and there joined the Cam. One consequence, however, of this operation was, that, during great inundations, that portion of the drainage which ran down the hundred-foot cuts got the start of that which descended down the more tortuous course of other rivers, and *overrode* the waters of the Cam; which in such cases, were caused to run up the country, in some cases for a considerable time. Various other circumstances and facts were mentioned respecting the ancient and recent history of these districts, with the operations of engineering connected with them; as for instance in 1720, when Denver sluice burst, and the waters ran up the Ouse for twenty days. Finally, some remarks were added, respecting the materials accumulated in the fens—their relative Levels—and the possibility of clearing them from water by cuts which would entirely supersede the necessity of water-mills and other artificial means of drainage now in use.

## NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A Review of Mr. S. Turner's excellent work on the "Sacred History of the World," and of Mr. Muston's "Recognition in the World to Come," if possible, in our next.

"Constant Reader," "W. L. B." "P. S." and the "Report of Society, &c." have been received.

"Percunctor," in our next.

We beg to thank "K. K." for his friendly hints. Some of them are impracticable; some, as to "Literary," not "quite correct;" others shew a lapsus memorie; see Vol. XI. 338. and all, had his address been known to us, we think we could have satisfactorily explained.

At "Resignation Bond," p. 302, in our last, we beg our readers to make reference to Vol. IX. 449, 706.

The work of Dr. Henderson is not forgotten.